FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-241
Monday
18 December 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-241 CONTENTS *18 December 1989*

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

- USSR Delegation Makes Proposals at Vienna Talks *[TASS]* 1
- Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Ends 14 Dec *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 1
- 5th Round of Nuclear Test Reduction Talks Ends *[TASS]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

- Minister on E. European Changes, Baltic Currencies *[TASS]* 3
- Common Features of 'Renewal' in Socialist Countries *[(Malynichenko) on Moscow International]* 3

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

- 18 Dec Foreign Ministry Press Briefing Reported 4
  - Response to Baker on Blocs' Role *[TASS]* 4
  - Upcoming Shevardnadze Visit to Belgium *[TASS]* 4
  - Pact's CFE Treaty Proposal *[TASS]* 4
  - UN Peace-Keeping Role *[TASS]* 5
  - Hun Sen's Call For Meeting *[TASS]* 5
  - TASS Summary 5
- Petrovskiy Attends UN Session in New York 6
  - Meets Delegations *[TASS]* 6
  - News Conference Summarizes Results *[TASS]* 6
- NATO Stereotypes Seen Giving Way to Realism *[PRAVDA 18 Dec]* 7

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

- Bush Interviewed on Gorbachev, Arms Cuts *[TASS]* 8
- Secretary Baker's Europe Trip Viewed 8
  - Moscow TV Analysis 8
  - Radio Commentary *[Kozyakov on Moscow International]* 9
- Commentary on Improved Sino-U.S. Relations *[Alekseyev on Moscow International]* 9
- U.S. Navy Completes 'Discarding' of Nuclear Arms *[TASS]* 10

Northeast Asia

- Peace Treaty Talks With Japan Resume 18 Dec *[Tokyo KYODO]* 10
  - Talks Open 18 Dec *[TASS]* 11
  - More on Talks *[Tokyo TV]* 11
  - Talks Make 'Little Progress' *[Tokyo KYODO]* 12
- Japanese Foreign Minister Overnights in Moscow *[Tokyo KYODO]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

- Rogachev Holds Talks With Lao Officials *[TASS]* 12
- Rogachev Visits Cambodia, Discusses Problems 12
  - Foreign Ministry Statement *[Moscow International]* 12
  - UN Role in Solution Backed *[Shchedrov on Moscow International]* 13
  - Rogachev Comments on Talks *[Moscow TV]* 13

Near East & South Asia

- Text of Gorbachev Message to Algerian President *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 14

- Bessmertnykh Meets UN Envoys on Afghanistan *[TASS]* 14
- Kabul Reports Wakil-Shevardnadze Moscow Meeting *[Kabul Radio]* 14
- Afghan Rebel Leader Returns to Pakistan *[TASS]* 14
- Commentary Views Iran-Pakistan Border Talks *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 15

East Europe

- Yakovlev Visits GDR, Meets Gysi, Modrow *[TASS]* 15
- 2d Phase of SED Extraordinary Congress Reported 16
  - Gorbachev Greets Congress *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 16
  - SED's 'Stalinist' Past Criticized *[TASS]* 17
  - SED 'Parting Company' With Stalinism *[Moscow Radio]* 17
  - Former Leaders' Account of Crisis Noted *[TASS]* 18
  - SED Changes Name *[TASS]* 19
  - Gysi Gives Report; Congress Ends *[TASS]* 19
- SED's Gysi Gives Interviews to Soviet Media 19
  - On FRG, USSR Ties, Public's View of SED *[Moscow TV]* 19
  - LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Interview *[No 50]* 22
- GDR's Christian Democrats Hold Congress *[TASS]* 23
- GDR's Democratic Awakening Party Holds Congress *[TASS]* 23
- CSSR Leaders To Visit Moscow 'This Week' *[Moscow International]* 23
- CPCZ Shadow Role in Government To End 31 Dec *[TASS]* 23
- CSSR Economy, Political System To Be Changed *[TASS]* 24
- CSSR Premier Calfa Discusses Economy *[Moscow TV]* 24
- Urbanek Discusses Criticism of CPCZ *[Moscow TV]* 25
- Slovak Communists' Emergency Congress Ends *[TASS]* 25
- MSZMP Congress Opens 17 Dec in Budapest *[TASS]* 26
- Walesa Urges Special Government Economic Powers *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 13 Dec]* 26
- 'Anti-Soviet' Demonstrations Held in Poland *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 27
- Problems in SFRY Society, Army Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Dec]* 27
- LCY President Thanks CPSU for Congratulations *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 28
- Economic Reasons Behind E. European Reforms *[(Malishev) on Moscow International]* 29

West Europe

- Shevardnadze Visit to Brussels, EC Talks Viewed 29
  - Accord Product of Rapprochement *[TASS]* 29
  - Shevardnadze Interviewed on EC *[TASS]* 30
  - Arrives in Brussels *[TASS]* 31
  - Meets Belgian Officials *[TASS]* 31
- TASS Comment on Keys to German Border Issue 31
- Possibilities for German Reunification Considered *[Moscow TV]* 32
- Mitterrand Takes Up 'Helsinki II' Proposal *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 Dec]* 33
- Turkish Paper Interviews General Varennikov *[Andara MILLIYET 6 Dec]* 34
- Cooperation With UK on Antidrug Operation *[Moscow Radio]* 34

Latin America & Caribbean

- TASS Reports U.S. Troops on Alert in Panama 35
  - U.S. Servicemen Cause 'Dangerous Incident' *[TASS]* 35
- Panama Says U.S. Sanctions 'State Terrorism' *[TASS]* 35

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Congress of People's Deputies

- FRG Radio, TV Equipment To Broadcast Congress *[TASS]* 36
- Moscow TV Relays 14 Dec Congress Meetings 36
  - 1304 GMT 15 Dec 36
  - 1324 GMT 36
  - 1355 GMT 37

- Congressional Sections' Debates Summarized *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 Dec]* 38
- Congress Forms Drafting Commissions *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 43
- Deputies' Speeches, Conduct Criticized *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 43
- Deputies Hit for Lack of Radical Ideas on Economy *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 44
- Moscow TV Relays 15 Dec Congressional Session 45
  - 1500 GMT 45
  - 1519 GMT 45
  - 1611 GMT 45
  - 1710 GMT 46
  - 1742 GMT 46
  - 1828 GMT 47
  - 1845 GMT 48
  - 1928 GMT 48
  - 2019 GMT 49
  - 2052 GMT 49
- Deputies Speak at 15 Dec Session 50
  - Khabarovsk's Danilyuk *[Moscow TV]* 50
  - Latvia's Gorbunov Urges Decentralization *[Moscow TV]* 50
  - Komi's Filippov on Miners' Motives *[Moscow TV]* 52
  - Moldavia's Snegur *[PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 52
  - Armenian Secretary Arutyunyan *[Yerevan Radio]* 55
  - Yeltsin Calls for Dismantling Central Control *[Moscow TV]* 55
- Abalkin Blasts Yeltsin Economic Reform Proposal *[TASS]* 57
  - Warns Struggle Inevitable *[Moscow TV]* 58
- Gorbachev Addresses Congress 15 Dec on Agenda *[Moscow TV]* 58
- Resolution on Ethnic Rights Adopted *[TASS]* 59
- Panel Decision on Meskhetian Turks *[TASS]* 59
- Armenian Deputy Explains Congress Walkout *[Moscow International]* 59
- Moscow TV Relays 16 Dec Congressional Session 59
  - 1300 GMT 59
  - 1436 GMT 60
  - 1534 GMT 61
  - 1621 GMT 62
  - 1710 GMT 63
  - 1806 GMT 63
- Deputies Address 16 Dec Congress Session 64
  - Leningrad's Gidaspov on Economic Reform *[Moscow TV]* 64
  - General Moiseyev on Armed Forces *[Moscow TV]* 65
  - Arbatov on Economic Development *[Moscow TV]* 68
  - Ryzhkov's 'Final' Speech *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 70
- Ryzhkov Discusses Economic Program *[TASS]* 72
  - Comments on Economic Debate *[Moscow International]* 73
  - Expresses Commitment to Program *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 17 Dec]* 74
- 16 Dec Economic Debate Detailed *[TASS]* 75
- Leningrad's Gidaspov Interviewed at Congress *[Moscow International]* 76
- Most Deputies Reportedly Support Gradual Change *[TASS]* 76
- Congress Debates Constitutional Amendments *[TASS]* 77
- Lukyanov Reports on Electoral System Changes *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 77
- Primakov Reports on Draft Standing Orders *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 81
- Biryukova Interviewed on Consumer Goods Program *[PRAVDA 17 Dec]* 85
- Extremism on Right Called Threat to Perestroyka *[IZVESTIYA 18 Dec]* 86
- Radio Audience Polled on Congress Results *[Moscow Radio]* 86
- 18 Dec Congress Session 'Expected To Be Short' *[TASS]* 87

Political & Social

- Official Announcement of Sakharov Death Issued *[TASS]* 87
  - Burial Details Announced *[TASS]* 87
  - Ceremony at Palace of Youth *[TASS]* 88
- Gorbachev Comments on Relations With Sakharov *[Moscow TV]* 88
  - Says Sakharov's Death 'Great Loss' *[Moscow International]* 88

- Media Treatment of Sakharov's Death Questioned *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Dec]* 88
- Yelena Bonner on Sakharov's Life, Funeral *[Moscow TV]* 89
- People Pay Tribute to Sakharov *[TASS]* 89
- Leaders Attend Sakharov Funeral 18 Dec *[Moscow Radio]* 90
- Moscow Memorial Gathering Held for Sakharov *[TASS]* 90
- Newspaper Publishes Special Issue on Sakharov *[Moscow TV]* 90
- Sakharov's November Interview in POLITYKA *[Warsaw POLITYKA 25 Nov]* 91
- Lithuanian Party Plenum Held 15 Dec *[Vilnius International]* 94
  - Agenda Reported *[Vilnius Radio]* 94
  - Brazauskas Report Approved *[TASS]* 95
- Lithuanians Term Afghan Invasion 'Crime' *[Vilnius International]* 95
- Lithuanian Aktiv Warns Against Party Split *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 15 Dec]* 95
- Lithuanian Political Scene Described *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 97
- Jewish Newspaper Published in Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 100
- Lithuanian SSR Draft Property Law Published 100
  - Supreme Soviet Decree *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 29 Nov]* 100
  - Text of Draft Property Law *[SOVETSKAYA LITVA 29 Nov]* 100
- Vilnius Rally Supports Unity with USSR *[Vilnius Radio]* 103
- Lithuanian Leader on Congress of People's Deputies *[Vilnius Radio]* 103
- Marchers Protest Recruit's Shooting by Militiamen *[Vilnius Radio]* 104
- New Latvian Legal Publication Issued *[Moscow Radio]* 104
- Appeal Made for Renewal of Latvian Party *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 28 Nov]* 104
- Latvian With Ties Abroad Has Weapons Cache *[TRUD]* 105
- 'Electoral Union' Impact on Tallinn Poll Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 14 Dec]* 105
- Estonian Deputy on Discussion of Declarations *[Tallinn Radio]* 106
- Latvian Election Results Detailed *[PRAVDA 15 Dec]* 106
- Baltic Public Opinion on Independence *[SOVETSKIY MOLODEZH 23 Nov]* 107
- Leningrad Party Secretary Gidaspov Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 108
  - Gidaspov Comments on Gorbachev *[Moscow International]* 110
- More on Pro-Perestroyka Leningrad Meeting *[SOVETSKAYA KULTURA 9 Dec]* 110
- Omsk Oblast Party Committee Secretary Elected *[Moscow Radio]* 111
- Moscow Meeting Supports Economic Reforms *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 Dec]* 111
- Ukraine Adopts Decree on Languages Law *[Kiev International]* 112
- Yerevan Reports on 15 Dec Earthquake in Armenia *[Yerevan Radio]* 112
- Yerevan Maintains Railway Blockade Continues *[Yerevan International]* 112
- Interregional Deputies Discuss Opposition Tactics *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Dec]* 112
- Kaluga Gorkom Political Club To Pursue Dialogue *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 114
- Cable TV To Begin Broadcasts in Kostamuksha *[Moscow Radio]* 114
- Increased Foreign Travel Brings 'Problems' *[PRAVDA 13 Dec]* 114

Economic

- Limits Imposed on Currency Exports to Bloc States *[IZVESTIYA 17 Dec]* 115
- Shalayev Discusses Laws To Resolve Labor Disputes *[TRUD 9 Dec]* 115
- Shalayev Endorses Price Control Resolution *[TRUD 26 Nov]* 118
- New Commission To Help With Defense Conversion *[TASS]* 120
- Rumors of 'Substantial' Car Price Hikes Denied *[IZVESTIYA 15 Dec]* 120

Scientific

- USSR launches 'Raduga' Communications Satellite *[TASS]* 121

Military

- Yazov Interviewed at Moscow Officers' Meeting *[Moscow TV]* 121
- Defense Ministry Reports 1990 Military Spending *[TASS]* 122
- Chervov Says 265,000 Discharged From Armed Forces *[TASS]* 122
- Officers' Assembly Appeals for Improved 'Quality' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]* 123

USSR Delegation Makes Proposals at Vienna Talks

LD1512175589 Moscow TASS in English 1727 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Vienna December 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov:

The Soviet delegation to the Vienna talks on confidence-building measures and security in Europe has voiced specific proposals developing the idea, advanced by the delegation earlier, of the transition to a universal method of notification about military activities.

The method is expected to help solve the problem of greater openness and predictability of military activity on the continent.

The Soviet side proposed, among other things, to work out a combined notification formula to be used for military manoeuevres involving ground, air and naval forces in cases when any of the involved components reaches a certain threshold—13,000 people, or 250 combat tanks, or 130 aircraft.

The formula is also to be used if 420 or more aircraft missions are performed throughout the manoeuvre, or 15 combat ships with a deadweight of 1,000 tonnes or more each are involved, or 50 naval aviation aircraft, or 3,000 troops participate.

This notification formula, head of the Soviet delegation ambassador at large assignments Oleg Grinveskiy told TASS, is not a mechanical compilation of effective and newly-proposed parameters. In fact it is an expression of a new conceptual approach taking into account the positions of different countries.

"We have considered NATO countries' complaints of the excessive complexity of the parameter relating to the notification about manoeuvres involving cruise-missile and aircraft carrying warships and decided to meet them halfway by omitting the parameter from the combined formula.

"Besides, the formula also takes into account the proposal by neutral and non-aligned states to include amphibious operations in the notification.

"All this, in our opinion, will facilitate good progress on the road towards developing and expanding results achieved in Stockholm," the Soviet delegation head pointed out.

Round of Chemical Weapons Talks Ends 14 Dec

PM1512120189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report: "Toward a Convention"]

[Text] Geneva, 14 Dec—The latest round of the Soviet-U.S. consultations on questions of a chemical weapons ban, which are being conducted in addition to the multilateral talks on drawing up an all-embracing convention in this sphere within the framework of the Disarmament Conference, ended here today.

A discussion of specific questions connected with the preparation of the future convention on the total prohibition and elimination of chemical weapons and also with the fulfillment of the memorandum on understanding with regard to the bilateral experiment on verification and the exchange of data—the memorandum signed by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker in Wyoming 23 September 1989—was at the center of attention in the debate.

The consultations will resume next year.

5th Round of Nuclear Test Reduction Talks Ends

LD1512155589 Moscow TASS in English 1502 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Geneva December 15 TASS—The fifth round of the Soviet-American talks on limiting and ultimately ending nuclear weapon testing ended here today.

In a statement at the close of this round of the talks, Soviet chief delegate Igor Palenykh pointed out that the Soviet and American delegations did a large amount of work to coordinate the text of a draft control protocol to the 1974 Treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear weapon tests.

The formula, worked out by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker at their meeting in Wyoming in September, for a mechanism to verify compliance with the treaty, enabled the two sides to make considerable headway in coordinating most of the provisions of the future protocol.

The negotiators believe that the remaining issues are also solvable. Their coordination will enable the delegations to finalise work both on the protocol to the 1974 Treaty and on a similar protocol to the 1976 Treaty on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes that was coordinated at the talks earlier.

Thereby the delegations would accomplish the task, set during the recent Soviet-American summit, of submitting the two protocols to the next Soviet-American summit in Washington in June 1990 for signature.

The completion of the work on the above-mentioned treaties would signify the attainment of the objectives of the first phase of the negotiations.

So, a discussion of further radical limitations on the yield and number of nuclear tests with a view to fully ending them is beginning to acquire increasing practical importance. The Soviet side believes it essential to set about accomplishing this task without unnecessary delays, i.e. without waiting for the ratification of the 1974 and 1976 treaties by the legislative bodies of the two countries.

They can do this by utilising the businesslike atmosphere that has taken shape at the talks and the experience the negotiators have gained in the solution of problems connected with control over the limitation on nuclear tests.

It was precisely with such an understanding that the sides agreed in 1987 to begin these talks. This is the same understanding that the Soviet delegation is now guided by in its activities.

The Soviet Union reaffirms its readiness immediately, omitting intermediate phases, to begin to discuss the principal issue at the talks—full termination of nuclear tests and a total ban on them.

Minister on E. European Changes, Baltic Currencies

LD1512203189 Moscow TASS in English 2006 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Political developments in Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic and Hungary do not affect the economic interrelations with these countries. All mutual commitments linking the Soviet Union with these countries are honoured, Soviet Finance Minister Valentin Pavlov said today.

The minister told journalists accredited at the second Congress of People's Deputies that he personally favoured settlements between member-countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) on the basis of world prices.

The delay in the transition to this practice, he said, was a brake on the rate of scientific and technological progress in the CMEA countries.

Preparations for the introduction of new principles in mutual settlements have been going on for five years, Pavlov recalled, however, the countries' internal interest hampered progress.

Journalists mostly questioned the minister about prospects for the normalisation of the Soviet economy. He admitted that the spiralling growth of the amount of money in circulation over the past two years resulted from errors in the system of distribution and taxation.

The main task now is to create a mechanism to pump excessive money out of turnover and to eliminate the state budget deficit.

Speaking about the possible introduction by the Baltic republics of their own currencies, Minister Pavlov said it would result in disrupting the market and undermining the single national economic complex.

Common Features of 'Renewal' in Socialist Countries

OW1612222189 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 16 Dec 89

[(Malynichenko) commentary]

[Text] Commenting on the process of renewal in the socialist countries, Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, pointed out that they all have developed along the same main direction. In his speech at a CPSU Central Committee plenum on 9 December, he said: Judging from the features of the penetrating changes occurring in the socialist countries, it is undeniable that they are heading toward the same main direction as our reforms even though we have never, in any way, urged them to do so. Our station commentator, (Malynichenko), writes on this:

The vigorous process of renewal which recently has swept most East European countries, began at different times and in different forms in various countries. This process began in Poland in the early 1980's, and in the GDR only a few weeks ago. China initiated its reforms in the late 1970's, while in 1968 the CSSR had its first try, which was stopped because of interference by five Warsaw Pact nations. At any rate, their reforms share some characteristics despite great differences. What are they? First of all, the causes of the reforms are the same. The mode of socialism in these countries had lost its vitality. Administrative orders [words indistinct] became the obstacle to progress in the socialist countries. Therefore, the reforms are aimed primarily at (?getting rid of) the dictatorial bureaucratic system and replacing it with a new mode of socialism. The process of renewal in the socialist countries has proved that they are formulating a new mode of socialism. Although each country has its own national characteristics and tries to solve its problems with its own methods, there is an obvious common characteristic; namely, the economic reforms are aimed at eliminating excessive centralization in the management of the national economy, expanding the powers of producers, transforming the methods of economic management, and developing the relations between commodities and currency. The ultimate goal of their reforms is to improve the people's livelihood and to raise the standards of their material life.

The process of reform in the socialist countries has proven that it is not limited to economic methods. The democratization of social life inevitably will continue and enter the sphere of social life because it will be difficult to achieve economic advances without political reforms. This is why these countries have increased the openness, encouraged diversified opinions, and instituted the system of multiple candidates in elections to political power organs so that the broad masses of the people will participate actively in social life. In this way, the new mode of socialism formulated through joint efforts will produce a highly efficient economy, highly developed science and technology, extensive freedom, and a people's regime. Therefore, it is of great significance for each socialist country to exchange experiences with other countries.

18 Dec Foreign Ministry Press Briefing Reported

Response to Baker on Blocs' Role

LD1512172289 Moscow TASS in English 1655 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Remarks by U.S. Secretary of State James Baker that the primary task of NATO should be to seek to establish a new European security system in which the military component will be slackened and the political one enhanced "in many respects coincides with the Soviet Union's policy of consistently shifting emphases in ensuring the security of countries from military to political means," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gherman Gvintsadze said at a briefing in Moscow today.

He was commenting on the U.S. secretary of state's remarks in the West Berlin Press Club on December 13.

Gvintsadze recalled the principled line of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Treaty allies that favour a simultaneous disbandment of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO and, as the first step, the disbandment of their military structures.

At the same time he pointed out the realism makes one proceed from the need to keep the two alliances in the foreseeable future.

"Let them transfom taking account of internal processes, determine their place in the new situation and cooperate with each other," he said.

"The Soviet Union proceeds from the premise that the military-political alliances can make a considerable contribution to consolidating European security."

It is important to develop constructive contacts between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO as a component of the CSCE process and the building of a Common European Home in the conditions of equilibrium and sufficient security, Gvintsadze emphasised.

"We do not deny the role of NATO as a significant element of the established balance of forces," he said. "But we expect that officials in the capitals of NATO countries also come to realise the importance of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation for the maintenance of stability and security in Europe."

In this connection touching upon further refinement of the Warsaw Treaty activities, the Soviet diplomat said that the Warsaw Treaty countries call for the strengthening of the alliance, specifically by creating a permanent political body.

The Soviet Union believes that work to refine the activities of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation should be done with an eye to developing parliamentary cooperation and establishing a structure for cooperation in civilian sectors.

Speaking of the establishment of contacts between the Warsaw Treaty Organisation and NATO, Gvintsadze said that military contacts could play a considerable role in removing distrust between the countries of the two blocs through exchanges of information on each other's proposals and initiatives, cuts in defence spending, discussion of military doctrines and exchanges of military delegations.

Upcoming Shevardnadze Visit to Belgium

LD1512182289 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—The Soviet Union attaches great significance to contacts with Belgian statesmen and views Belgium as an interesting partner sensitive to European and global issues, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He noted that Soviet-Belgian relations "have been stable at all stages and passed unscathed through the trial of the Cold War and the period of East-West confrontation".

The Soviet Union is confident, Perfilyev said, that the talks in Brussels on December 18-19 between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Belgian leaders will enable them to discuss ways to further develop the European process and strengthen mutual understanding and interaction.

The Soviet spokesman also noted that the planned signing in Brussels of an agreement on trade, commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities would be an important step towards the creation of an economic space in Europe and the consolidation of economic stability and cooperation in Europe.

"The Soviet Union proceeds from the fact that economic integration is the requirement of European development," Perfilyev stressed.

Speaking about the forthcoming meeting in Brussels between Shevardnadze and NATO Secretary-General Manfred Woerner, Perfilyev noted that it would provide an opportunity to exchange opinions on matters of mutual interest.

Pact's CFE Treaty Proposal

LD1512183389 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—"The pledge of all participating nations to reduce to agreed upper limits six categories of conventional armed forces is the key provision of the draft Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe [CFE] that was submitted by the Warsaw Treaty states at yesterday's plenary session within the framework of the Vienna talks," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

He said that the six categories are troops, tanks, artillery, armoured vehicles, combat planes and helicopters.

Perfilyev drew attention to the fact that the structure of the draft treaty covers practically all issues discussed at the talks.

"As to the application of the treaty, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation firmly sticks to positions of the Vienna mandate," Perfilyev said. The treaty would be of unlimited duration.

Recalling that the NATO countries also submitted their draft treaty on Thursday, Perfilyev observed that both documents "proceed in the same direction, although there are substantial differences" between them.

The NATO document envisages the establishment of upper limits only for troops of the USSR and the United States, which are deployed outside their national territories, and does not take into account the troops of great Britain, France, the Netherlands and Belgium deployed in West Germany, he said.

On the whole, the spokesman said, the submission of the two drafts is a major step within the framework of the Vienna talks, imparting a new important dimension to the negotiating process.

UN Peace-Keeping Role

LD1512184189 Moscow TASS in English 1803 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—Countries are determined to increase the U.N. role in maintaining international order, Vasiliy Sidorov, deputy head of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs directorate for International Organizations, told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on the results of the discussion by the 44th session of the U.N. General Assembly of United Nations peacekeeping efforts.

The Soviet diplomat pointed out that the General Assembly was interested in the idea of using United Nations operations to prevent international crises and conflicts. The idea was suggested by the Soviet delegation in a memorandum on increasing U.N. preventive functions.

Great attention was paid to other Soviet proposals, including the reserve of U.N. military observers and armed forses, U.N. operations at sea and the stepping up of the work of the U.N. Security Council Military Staff Committee.

Speaking about the importance of a corresponding resolution adopted at the 44th session of the U.N. peacekeeping operations out of the sphere of theory and offered some practical measures to step up the efforts of countries in strengthening the potential of the U.N. peacekeeping force.

On the whole, the resolution accords with the Soviet concept of strengthening international security through boosting the U.N. image and role. The Soviet Union is determined to work for the implementation of recommendations contained in the resolution, improve multilateral peace-keeping mechanisms and increase the U.N. role in forming a new model of international security, Sidorov said.

Hun Sen's Call For Meeting

LD1512191589 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—The Soviet Union welcomes and supports the recent call of Cambodian Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Hun Sen for a new unofficial meeting in Jakarta, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev said at a briefing today.

Hun Sen called for a new meeting as part of the Paris forum to discuss the creation of an international control mechanism to monitor the ceasefire and any foreign military aid to the Cambodian sides.

In his statement Hun Sen stressed Cambodia's readiness to discuss the formation of provisional government bodies for the transitional period, taking account of proposals advanced by Australian Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade Gareth Evans.

The initiatives of the Cambodian leader, the spokesman said, provide new evidence of the constructive approach of the Cambodian Government to all unresolved aspects of the Cambodian settlement and its goodwill. This opens favourable conditions for progress towards a comprehensive settlement of the Cambodian problem, the spokesman said. The USSR will continue its assistance to this process, he stressed.

TASS Summary

LD1512192689 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—The Soviet Union is confident, that the talks in Brussels on December 18-19 between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Belgian leaders will enable them to discuss ways to further develop the European process and strengthen mutual understanding and interaction the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Vadim Perfilyev told a briefing here today.

The Soviet spokesman also noted that the planned signing in Brussels of an agreement on trade, commercial and economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the European Communities would be an important step towards the creation of an economic space in Europe and the consolidation of economic stability and cooperation in Europe.

Speaking about the forthcoming meeting in Brussels between Shevardnadze and NATO Secretary-General

Manfred Woerner, Perfilyev noted that it would provide an opportunity to exchange opinions on matters of mutual interest.

Perfilyev informed journalists that the Presidium of the second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR today formed a commission to organise the funeral of people's deputy Academician Andrey Sakharov who died yesterday at age 68.

"The pledge of all participating nations to reduce to agreed upper limits six categories of conventional armed forces is the key provision of the draft treaty on conventional armed forces in Europe that was submitted by the Warsaw Treaty states at yesterday's plenary session within the framework of the Vienna talks," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Vadim Perfilyev went on.

Perfilyev drew attention to the fact that the structure of the draft treaty covers practically all issues discussed at the talks.

Recalling that the NATO countries also submitted their draft treaty on Thursday, Perfilyev observed that both documents "proceed in the same direction, although there are substantial differences" between them.

On the whole, the spokesman said, the submission of the two drafts is a major step within the framework of the Vienna talks, imparting a new important dimension to the negotiating process.

The USSR Foreign Ministry statement read out by Perfilyev says that the Soviet Union welcomes and supports the recent call of Cambodian Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs Hun Sen for a new unofficial meeting in Jakarata.

Hun Sen called for a new meeting as part of the Paris forum to discuss the creation of an international control mechanism to monitor the ceasefire and any foreign military aid to the Cambodian sides.

Three press-conferences were held within the framework of the briefing. The speakers were USSR Defense Ministry representatives Generals Nikolay Chervov and Vladimir Babyev, USSR Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gherman Gvintsadze and Vasiliy Sidorov.

Petrovskiy Attends UN Session in New York

Meets Delegations

LD1512225789 Moscow TASS in English 2240 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 16 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy met delegations of a number of countries and international organisations in New York.

During a meeting with New Zealand Foreign Minister Cedric Russell Marshall, prospects for the development of the two countries' cooperation in bilateral and international affairs as well as in the Asia-Pacific region were discussed.

The problems of the Iran-Iraq settlement were at the centre of attention during his meeting with Iraqi foreign minister Tariq 'Aziz and Iranian deputy foreign minister Manuchehr Mottaki.

Current matters of the activities of the United Nations and U.N. specialised agencies as well as cooperation between the two countries in the field of multilateral diplomacy were considered during a meeting with John Bolton, assistant to the U.S. secretary of state.

Soviet-Austrian cooperation in military-political and ecological aspects of U.N. activities was the principal subject during a meeting with Thomas Klestil, general secretary of the Austrian Foreign Ministry.

Petrovskiy had an exchange of views with Ambassador Otunnu, president of the International Peace Academy, on the need to use scientific resources on a large scale in U.N. peacekeeping activities.

Petrovskiy also met artist Mikhail Shemyakin, chairman of the International Commtitee for the rescue of Soviet prisoners of war in Afghanistan.

News Conference Summarizes Results

LD1512235389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1812 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] New York, 15 Dec (TASS)—There are currently 627,500 Soviet servicemen outside the borders of the Soviet Union. This figure was revealed for the first time by V.F. Petrovskiy, USSR deputy foreign minister; at a news conference which took place here today. Having made such an important announcement, he expressed the hope that this will help gradually phase out foreign military presence on a global scale. Our ultimate goal, the USSR deputy foreign minister stressed, is to not have a single Soviet soldier abroad. The Soviet Union intends to achieve its solution by the year 2000, but this, he explained, must not be a unilateral step.

At the news conference, V.F. Petrovskiy summed up the results of the 44th U.N. General Assembly session which has just ended. He indicated that the processes of renewal, brought to the United Nations under the influence of the new political thinking, are being transferred onto the plane of specific deeds. The overcoming of the cold war has visible forms: Debates acquire the nature of joint struggle with complex problems rather than ideological confronatation between the parties involved. The new major advances in Soviet-U.S. relations, first and foremost the results of the unofficial meeting in Malta between M.S. Gorbachev and G. Bush, have had exceptional significance for the positive work of the General Assembly.

V.F. Petrovskiy further noted the joint initiative of the USSR and the United States in supporting the central, regulatory role of the United Nations in the system of peace, security and cooperation, and the strengthening of this system by finding many-sided approaches. It is exceptionally important that this resolution was approved by consensus and that among its co-authors were states of every political spectrum—of the East and West, North, and South. By this the General Assembly in its turn helped create favorable conditions for the advancement of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue. A point of departure has been created, as has a framework for further all embracing efforts to form a positive world through parallel measures of a bilateral and multilateral nature.

Among the session's assets are two international legal instruments: The convention on the defense of children's rights and the struggle against the activities of mercenaries. The declaration at the initiative of the Non-aligned Movement of the 1990's as the decade of international law is also a reflection of the growing recognition of international law as the basis for the stability of the stormy processes of renewal going on in the world and for the future global arrangement.

The general agreement in relation to the ultimate goals in disarmament has been confirmed: The complete destruction of nuclear weapons, the speediest destruction of chemical weapons, and the reduction in conventional arms on global and regional bases. At the session, the complete halting of nuclear tests was stressed. For the first time a decision was made on the problem of the conversion of the defense industry.

The system for solving conflicts and crises by political means has become more stable. On the basis of a consensus a resolution has been adopted in favor of national reconciliation in Afghanistan and the implementation of the Geneva accords by all sides. During the special session of the UN General Assembly which took place on the question of apartheid and its destructive consequences in southern Africa a document of consensus has been developed which will become a program of international actions to disassemble the system of apartheid.

Deserving of high appraisal is the decision on the practical preperations for holding in 1992 a UN conference on the enviroment and development.

In this way an intensive agenda for the further work of the general Assembly and other UN organs is planned. The most important thing now, V.F. Petrovskiy announced, is not to weaken efforts but to transfer the agreements achieved into the sphere of practical actions.

NATO Stereotypes Seen Giving Way to Realism

PM1712200689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Dec 89 Second Edition p 8

[Own correspondents V. Peresada, Yu. Kharlanov report: "Closer to the Realities"]

[Text] Brussels, 17 Dec—The present changes in the world are indeed affecting approaches and views that only yesterday appeared immutable. For many decades, the spirit of tough confrontation with the East hovered over the sessions of NATO's leadership organs. Of course, even today it has not disappeared entirely. But the NATO Council session at the level of foreign ministers which has just taken place in Brussels showed that in the North Atlantic alliance the stereotypes of past times are increasingly giving way to realistic views of the world situation, and a shift from confrontation to confidence is emerging increasingly clearly.

Judging by the results of the session, the NATO countries intend, first, to observe carefully, on a reciprocal basis, all the principles of the Helsinki Final Act; second, to promote the dynamics of change in Europe, including Eastern Europe, without seeking any unilateral advantages; third, to seek to expand trade and economic ties between East and West, making provision for the "rationalization" of the tough restrictive measures imposed by COCOM. One of the main objectives was named as the eradication of the division of Europe through the further development of dialogue and cooperation on the continent.

Of course, this cannot be achieved with the present level of military confrontation. Here, too, our policy and our initiatives in the disarmament sphere are influencing the conclusions now being drawn in NATO. The communique reaffirms the desire for the successful completion of talks on conventional arms reduction in Europe, welcomes the intention of the USSR and the United States to accelerate the drafting of an agreement on strategic offensive arms, and expresses the hope of achieving an accord on a chemical weapons ban.

But as we have said, not all the shadows of the past have departed from the NATO hall of sessions. Thus the bloc's traditional commitment to the strategy of deterrence, based on a combination of nuclear and conventional arms, was reaffirmed. It is still being said that the presence of American troops, including those equipped with nuclear weapons, in Western Europe is "vitally important" to the alliance.

Among the most characteristic features of the session, we noted this: The desire increasingly to step up NATO's political functions. This is also mentioned in the concluding document. Time will tell what this means in practice, but for the moment the participants in the meeting confined themselves to general expressions. It became known behind the scenes at the session that disagreements had arisen on this score. The French representatives, in particular, think that NATO should not be the West's main political forum in the atmosphere of the present changes in Europe. The leading role here, in their opinion, belongs to the Helsinki process and the European Community. This, in our view, reflects the position of those circles that fear that the U.S. influence on European affairs could increase still further through NATO.

United States & Canada

Bush Interviewed on Gorbachev, Arms Cuts

LD1812091289 Moscow TASS in English
0846 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 18 TASS—U.S. President George Bush gave an interview to the U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT.

Touching on the policy of President Mikhail Gorbachev, Bush said: "As he gives his steadfast support to peaceful change—and I do emphasize the words peaceful and change—it's a very impressive performance and it deserves our support to the degree we can give it. I think that Gorbachev is handling it well. You can just feel the emotion inside the Soviet Union. We have a big stake in seeing peaceful change there and in Eastern Europe."

"There has been such a euphoric feeling on Capitol Hill about this change," Bush continued, "that they think they can just cut the heart out of the defence programme. And that I will resist. I don't want to encourage the thought that we always have to operate at these substantial levels (of military spending). But on the other hand, I don't want to encourage reckless cuts. I think the first step ought to be our CFE agreement (to reduce Conventional Forces in Europe). And then we must be sure that we don't recklessly go off without consultation of our allies. This is no time to unravel the NATO alliance."

Turning to the "peace dividend" Bush said: "For those to say now that there is a peace dividend to cut the Defense Department in half and put the money into domestic spending, that is not fiscally sound (in terms of) the need for deficit reduction. And it is not sound in terms of what our defense posture should be".

Turning again to the question of conventional forces on the European continent, Bush said: "If you have a radical troop change in Eastern Europe, you will have a very different requirement for a U.S. presence in numbers and for an allied defence posture." However, the President said he could not foresee a time when the United States would have no forces deployed in Europe.

Asked about the possibility of reducing the strategic arsenals of the two superpowers more than by one half, the head of the U.S. Administration stressed that it was first necessary to conclude the agreements on strategic and conventional armaments that are now on the table. "Let's make that step first, but not have it the last step," Bush said.

Secretary Baker's Europe Trip Viewed

Moscow TV Analysis

[From the "International Panorama " program]

LD1712194989 Moscow Television Service
in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] The changes in Eastern Europe are forcing Western Europe—both in the NATO bloc and neutral—to define its position. The latter—neutral Europe—includes countries such as Austria, Sweden and Switzerland who are members of EFTA, the European Free Trade Association. On 12 December in Geneva, EFTA ministers adopted a statement in which they proclaim their obligation to support the reforms in Eastern Europe. NATO has more than once taken just such a position, in general terms, both before and after Malta, when Bush, en route for Washington, met his allies in Brussels.

The topic of reaction to the reforms in Eastern Europe returned to the Belgian capital on Thursday at a routine winter session of the NATO Council involving foreign ministers. Before the session, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker made a trip through a number of European countries. On Wednesday, in Potsdam near Berlin, he met GDR Prime Minister Hans Modrow, conversing with him for 1 and ½ hours. This was the first meeting ever at such a level between representatives of the United States and the GDR, and of course, was no accident. Baker expressed United States interest in the peaceful and stable development of the political processes in the GDR. Here is what a correspondent of the U.S. television company ABC reported on this score: Prime Minister Modrow has remained in power for a whole month in most difficult political conditions. If he fails, there will be chaos in the country, Bush advisers consider. In this context, Washington is striving to assist the stabilization of the situation in East Germany.

In West Berlin's press club, the secretary of state presented perhaps the most detailed exposition of Washington's views so far on the future of Europe. Its main emphasis is maximum stability under conditions of change. To this end, according to Washington's vision of the Europe of tomorrow, three main elements of U.S. policy, and of U.S. relations with the Old World remain. NATO remains—but a transformed NATO, with a greater accent on its political and not its military aspect. Baker promises new initiatives for the development of economic and political relations with the East, for providing aid, as he said, for the construction of democratic institutions, and the creation of a climate for investment and trade between the West and the East. The EEC remains. Lately, various questions have arisen about its fate of late as a result of plans for the reunification of Germany which have generally alarmed the FRG's West European partners. The Helsinki process remains an all-European one, with the United States and Canada involved. In Baker's view it can become the most important forum for cooperation between the East and the West. In general terms, under the new conditions, Washington would like there to be a strengthening of the institutions of cooperation between the two parts of our continent, and the transformation to peaceful ends, of institutions created for confrontation. This approach can be welcomed.

Baker particularly singled out the matter of Germany and the prospects for its reunification. In the first place, he actually spoke against haste and against any kind of specific reunification plan as he put it, and thus, for the preservation in the foreseeable future of the two German states. Second, he singled out a thesis which requires further clarification—that reunification, if this comes about, should take place within the context of the preservation of West Germany's adherence to the North Atlantic alliance. Third, he quite reasonably stressed that movement toward reunification should take place peacefully, gradually and within the framework of a step-by-step process. Fourth, and this is important, the secretary of state spoke on the matter of borders—support for the Final Act of Helsinki, that is, the principle of the inviolability of the post war borders.

Radio Commentary

LD1512054889 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Commentary by station observer Vladislav Kozyakov]

[Text] Our observer Vladislav Kozyakov comments on the latest trip to Europe by Secretary of State Baker.

In the light of the current events in Eastern and Western Europe, the foremost criteria to judge state policies is how balanced they are and how well they serve to keep stability on the continent. Pronouncements by the secretary of state and his talks with European leaders show a positive development of American policies in that direction. In the course of his trip Secretary Baker visited the German Democratic Republic, where he met with Prime Minister Hans Modrow. This was a significant fact, the first ever meeting of an American secretary of state with a GDR leader. This is seen as United States support for the sovereignty and independence of the GDR and for its greater role in the system of international relations. This is important, since the Republic's sovereignty is a vital factor in keeping peace and stability in central Europe. Prime Minister Modrow welcomed a dialogue with America supporting his country's reforms. Secretary Baker concluded their talks by pledging more support for the process of reforms in a peaceful and stable manner.

In his speech in West Berlin on Tuesday, which he described as new architecture for Europe, Secretary Baker again displayed that balanced approach towards European problems. He called for considering NATO's new goals in the changed situation, for an agreement on reductions of conventional arms and armed forces from the Atlantic to the Urals, and setting up a verifying mechanism. He put forward some ideas on further development of the European process and mutually advantageous cooperation between East and West Europe, also between Europe and America.

Many aspects of American policy set forth by James Baker are close or identical to the Soviet approach, particularly in view of the reserve and responsibility towards events in Europe and (?widening) cooperation and interaction for better living standards and for peace and stability. That reflects the agreement reached recently at the summit in Malta. As Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out, he had reached a hopeful degree of understanding with President Bush on a need for a balanced and cautious policy towards deep changes in Western and Eastern Europe, especially where Germany is concerned. On the question of Germany's reunificiaiton, the secretary of state remarked reasonably that the process shouldn't be pushed, that it should consider the natural concerns of all creators—the architects of a new Europe—that old rights and obligations of Second World War allies, including the Soviet Union, should be considered.

Commentary on Improved Sino-U.S. Relations

OW1712103889 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Commentary by Alekseyev]

[Text] A delegation of high-ranking U.S. officials headed by Scowcroft, assistant to the President on national security affairs, visited Beijing. We will now broadcast commentator Alekseyev's remarks in this connection.

The U.S. delegation was received at high level and Mr Scowcroft held talks with such leaders as Chairman Deng Xiaoping, CPC Central Committee General Secretary Jiang Zemin, and Premier Li Peng. In these meetings, he briefed them on the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit talks held in Malta, and discussed Sino-U.S. relations with them.

As reported in U.S. newspapers, Sino-U.S. relations are currently frozen due to the sanctions U.S. authorities took against China in June, and official political contacts between Washington and Beijing have also become stagnated. The Chinese side has incessantly pointed out that it should not be held responsible for the deteriorated relations with the United States, but that the United States should take the first step toward the normalization of relations.

In this connection, THE WASHINGTON POST has pointed out that the visit to Beijing by Scowcroft, assistant to the President on national security affairs, is a compromise by the U.S. to the Chinese. However, Washington's official explanation differs from this view. The White House spokesman stated that Mr Scowcroft's visit was special in nature and disclosed that the political as well as economic sanctions against China have not been lifted yet.

Chairman Deng Xiaoping told Mr Scowcroft that even if disputes over and great differences in views on several issues still do exist between China and the United States, the relations between the two nations must be improved in the long run since the improvement of bilateral relations is needed to promote stability in the world. We cannot but agree with such a view.

Meanwhile, according to KYODO NEWS SERVICE from Tokyo, both the United States and China admitted to the need to promote bilateral relations in the future, and Mr Scowcroft informed Prime Minister Kaifu of this fact when he visited Japan, following his visit to Beijing, to brief the Japanese leadership on the outcome of the Malta talks and on his talks with the Chinese leadership. And then, he held talks with Foreign Minister

Nakayama. At this meeting, Foreign Minister Nakayama advocated that relations between Japan and China should be improved, and also stated that tension between the two nations is unfavorable to the situation in whole Asia.

On the other hand, Chief Cabinet Secretary Moriyama stated at a news conference that Japan has no intention of lifting restriction on high-level exchanges with China at this moment, and that the restriction was decided at the summit talks of the seven advanced industrialized nations held in Paris last July.

Moreover, at his meeting with Mr Scowcroft, Foreign Minister Nakayama welcomed the results of the Malta talks and stated that the advance in East-West relations has given practical prospects for the improvement of relations between Japan and the Soviet Union, and he also stated his agreement to open up a new page in the development of such relations.

U.S. Navy Completes 'Discarding' of Nuclear Arms

LD1812094589 Moscow TASS in English 0808 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Washington December 18 TASS—The U.S. Navy has completed a programme for discarding nuclear depth charges Usrock and nuclear antiaircraft missiles Terrier. As a result, the number of nuclear-capable warships dwindled from 187 in 1987 to 49 now, that is the lowest number since the 1950s.

All in all, 21 per cent of U.S. warships are now nuclear capable as against 76 per cent two years ago.

This information was made public today by the organisation Greenpeace on the basis of data supplied by the U.S. Energy Department which is in charge of nuclear weaponry. The data was received under the law on the freedom of information.

In its report, Greenpeace says only of ships capable of carrying nuclear warheads. [sentence as received] The number of ships which have them, is top secret. This data is not supplied under the law on the freedom of information.

The Pentagon refused to comment on Greenpeace's information. However, a high-ranking official of the Defence Department told the UPI News Agency that it had been made public several months ago that the U.S. Navy was discarding outdated nuclear systems.

However, this should not be regarded as a signal to the Soviet Union on a U.S. readiness to begin talks on naval arms control, stressed the official who asked not to be identified.

Earlier, Admiral Carlisle Trost, chief of the U.S. naval staff, told the AP News Agency that he was resolutely against talks with the Soviet Union on cutting the naval forces of the two powers.

It is not in the interests of the United States to have weak or weaker navy. The U.S. needs forces which the country has now as an absolute minimum, Trost said.

Even if the Soviet Union completely destroys its naval potential, the U.S. demands to the Navy will remain the same, since there are many countries in the world, which do not always treat the U.S. in a friendly way, the admiral said.

Northeast Asia

Peace Treaty Talks With Japan Resume 18 Dec

OW1512140089 Tokyo KYODO in English 1310 GMT 15 Dec 89

[By Tim Johnson]

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 15 KYODO—Japan and the Soviet Union on Monday will conduct their fourth round of working-level negotiations on a peace treaty, still seeking a solution to their decades-old dispute over a group of northern islands, Japanese officials said Friday.

The Soviet side will be headed by veteran negotiator Igor Rogachev, a deputy foreign minister, who will face off with Japanese counterpart Hisashi Owada in two separate 150-minute sessions.

Rogachev, who will arrive in Japan on Saturday from a meeting in Phnom Penh with Kampuchean Prime Minister Hun Sen, will hold separate meetings with Owada and Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama on Tuesday, after the formal conclusion of the peace treaty talks.

Japanese officials expect Monday's working group meeting to be devoted to a Soviet presentation of views in response to those presented by Japan at the previous meeting in Moscow last April.

The Soviet delegation is likely to press historical and legal arguments on the territorial issue and to elucidate their vision of the content of the peace treaty, officials said.

Leaders of both countries have welcomed the gradual improvement of bilateral relations, expressing hope that major headway will be made before Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev makes his historic visit to Japan in 1991.

But amid a blossoming of East-West relations elsewhere in the world, Japan-Soviet reconciliation has moved forward in small increments due to Japan's insistence on the return of Kunashiri, Etorofu and Shikotan Islands, and the Habomai Islets, which were seized by the Soviets at the end of World War II.

Foreign Ministry officials said they expect no surprises in the current round of talks, the fourth since they first began at Japan's initiative during Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Japan last December.

The Soviets dominated the subsequent meeting in Tokyo in March, surprising Japan with a barrage of detailed arguments to back their claims to the islands.

But the Japanese took the offensive with a lengthy rebuttal at the following meeting in Moscow last April.

Officials said Japan's response to the Soviets newest set of arguments will come at the fifth working-level meeting, expected to be held shortly before Shevardnadze visits Japan for a second time in March.

When leading Soviet Politburo member and chief foreign policy strategist Aleksandr Yakovlev came to Japan in November, he spoke highly of the working groups, saying they represent a "third way" of putting Japan-Soviet ties onto a sounder footing though broadened dialogue.

Playing down the territorial issue, the Soviets have maintained since the April meeting that the two sides should first undertake to resolve matters on which their views are closer together.

This way, the process of finding a solution to "the most difficult problem" would be "simplified," Soviet diplomats have said.

But Foreign Ministry officials say without a clearer prospect for a resolution of the territorial problem, it is both illogical and unrealistic to expect other problems to be so easily cleared up.

The officials said the most "crucial" area of dispute in the negotiations is the status of the islands at the conclusion of World War II.

The Soviet Union, which opposes any realignment of postwar borders, holds that the islands were included among the Kuriles conceded to Soviet control in 1945 at the Yalta conference in return for Soviet entry into the war against Japan.

The Soviets also note that Japan renounced its sovereignty over the Kuriles when it signed the San Francisco peace treaty.

But Japan counters that the four islands concerned are geographically not part of the Kurile Archipelago to begin with.

It also points out that the Yalta agreement is of dubious international legality and has no bearing on the issue anyway as Japan was never a party to it. Likewise, Japan notes that Moscow was not a party to the San Francisco peace treaty.

Japan cites various written and oral agreements with the Soviet Union to the effect that some of the islands would be returned after conclusion of a peace treaty.

Talks Open 18 Dec

LD1812094389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0419 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, 18 Dec. (TASS)—Today a 2-day sitting of the standing working group on a peace treaty between the USSR and Japan opened in Tokyo. The Soviet delegation is headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, and the Japanese delegation is led by Deputy Foreign Minister Hisashi Owada.

An agreement concerning the creation of the working group on a peace treaty was reached in December 1988 during the visit to Japan by USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze.

In the opinion of the Soviet side, frank discussions within the framework of the working group offer an opportunity to better understand each other's positions, and to promote building relations based on genuine mutual trust, a so far insufficient element. This eventually fosters the achievement of the set goal—the elaboration of a peace treaty, the conclusion of which is necessary for a radical improvement in relations between the two contries.

More on Talks

OW1812070989 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 0300 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Deputy minister-level consultations on the conclusion of a Japan-Soviet peace treaty is currently in progress at the Foreign Ministry's Iikura Hall in Tokyo. It follows the last round of such talks held in Moscow last April.

The deputy minister-level consultations are between Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs Owada and Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Rogachev and will last for 1 day.

In the consultations held thus far, the Japanese side has strongly called for the resolution of the northern territories issue as a prerequisite to the conclusion of a peace treaty. It said that when Japan and the Soviet Union restored their diplomatic relations in 1956, the two countries merely issued a joint statement without concluding a peace treaty because the territorial issue remained unresolved.

The Soviet side, on the other hand, has said it is necessary to define the substance of the peace treaty on a broad basis, which is to include trade and cooperation in the economic sector, and it advocates shelving the territorial issue, likening it to the Senkaku Islands issue between Japan and China.

Hence bitter words are expected to be exchanged at the consultations today as far as the northern territories issue is concerned.

Regarding the deputy minister-level consultations, when he visited Japan last month, Politburo Member Yakovlev made remarks indicating his desire to turn the consultations into a venue for talks for exploring a so-called third way for the resolution of the northern territories issue. In this connection, attention is being paid to whether or not there will be any change in the Soviet attitude.

Talks Make 'Little Progress'

OW1812124689 Tokyo KYODO in English
1210 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Tokyo, Dec. 18 KYODO—Japanese and Soviet peace treaty negotiators on Monday made little progress in resolving their dispute over four northern territories, with the Soviet delegation insisting on respect for the post-war borders, Foreign Ministry officials said. The Japanese flatly rejected the Soviet offer, the officials said.

"There was absolutely nothing like a fresh convergence of views," said an official briefing on the outcome of the negotiations at the Foreign Ministry's Iikura Guest House.

Officials said the negotiators, meeting for the fourth time since the working-level groups were set up last December, spent most of their six hours of talks debating historical and legal points to back up their claims to the disputed islands—Kunashiri, Etorofu, Shikotan and the Habomai group.

The Soviet side was headed by Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, while Deputy Foreign Minister Hisashi Owada led the Japanese delegation.

Japanese Foreign Minister Overnights in Moscow

OW1812012889 Tokyo KYODO in English
0101 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, Dec. 17 KYODO—Japanese Foreign Minister Taro Nakayama had to stay overnight in Moscow on Sunday when his return home from a trip to Europe was delayed due to problems with his plane.

Nakayama's plane stopped over at Moscow but was unable to continue the journey to Tokyo due to what officials called 'technical reasons.' He stayed overnight at a Moscow hotel.

He is scheduled to arrive in Tokyo on Monday but his flight time has not been fixed, the officials said.

Nakayama attended a ministerial meeting of 24 countries on aid for Poland and Hungary, held in Brussels last Wednesday, and then visited Austria.

In Tokyo, Foreign Ministry officials said it is 'doubtful' that Nakayama will meet Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze while in Moscow, saying his stay there is 'unofficial.'

But TASS News Agency reported that Shevardnadze was due in Brussels on Monday and Tuesday for talks with Belgian and European Community (EC) leaders and an unprecedented visit to the NATO headquarters. Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, meanwhile, is in Tokyo for the fourth session of bilateral peace treaty negotiations.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Rogachev Holds Talks With Lao Officials

LD1412180189 Moscow TASS in English
1450 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Text] Vientianne December 14 TASS—Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev, now visiting Vientianne, was received today by acting President of Laos Phoumi Vongvichit. Briefed by Rogachev on the Malta summit between the top Soviet and U.S. leaders, Vongvichit welcomed its results and said the Soviet-American talks bring the end of the cold war closer and usher in a new stage in the development of international situation.

Vongvichit told Rogachev about the situation in Laos and the broad societal renewal underway, guided by the people's revolutionary party of Laos. "Laos," the Lao leader said, "will remain a true friend of the Soviet Union and support its policy of perestroyka and new thinking in international affairs."

From December 12-14 consultations were held with the participation of the Soviet ambassador in Laos Yuriy Mikheyev. Participants analysed some aspects of Soviet-Lao relations as well as some regional and international problems. Special attention was given to the two countries (?interaction) in the Asia-Pacific region and to new approaches to Cambodian settlement.

On the Laotian side, consultations were pursued by Lao Acting Foreign Minister Thongsavat Khaykhamphithoun and Deputy Foreign Minister So[illegible]livong Prasithidet.

A plan for the cooperation between the Soviet and the Lao Foreign Ministries for 1990-1991 was signed.

Rogachev Visits Cambodia, Discusses Problems

Foreign Ministry Statement

BK1612132389 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia
1100 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Undated Soviet Foreign Ministry statement—read by announcer]

[Text] The USSR Foreign Ministry has just released a statement saying:

Nearly 3 months have passed since the generally recognized complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. This event created a new atmosphere for comprehensively solving the Cambodian problem. It could be a great impetus for the talks on solving the problem. However, in response to Phnom Penh's peaceful efforts, the opposing Cambodian side has intensified its attacks, pinning its hopes on a military solution based on force.

Faithful to its line of solving the problem politically and peacefully, the State of Cambodia's government has put forward an important initiative, even in this situation, to continue negotiations. Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the State of Cambodia's Council of Ministers and foreign minister, in his statement to SPK, stressed that the State of Cambodia's government will continue to do all it can to quickly end the ongoing conflict and to end it through negotiations aimed at achieving national reconciliation. The Cambodian leader appealed for the immediate convening in Jakarta of a new round of unofficial talks within the framework of the Paris conference to discuss the establishment of an international control mechanism to supervise the cease-fire and the end of outside military aid to all Cambodian parties. The State of Cambodia's government proposed consultations with all parties concerned before convening a new unofficial meeting in Jakarta. Comrade Hun Sen expressed a readiness to examine the establishment of an interim administration in Cambodia in the transitional period in view of the proposal put forward by Australian Foreign Minister Evans. Comrade Hun Sen stressed that the United Nations could bring upon itself the role of controlling and supervising the implementation of agreements and the organization of a general election in Cambodia if the organization adhered to an unbiased role on the Cambodian issue and left Cambodia's seat in this organization vacant.

In the Soviet Union, people welcome and support the Cambodian leader's statement as a successive expression of a constructive attitude on various aspects of a solution that has not yet been unanimously agreed upon, and as a new, major act of goodwill by the State of Cambodia's government which offers a favorable possibility for moving step by step toward solving the Cambodian problem comprehensively. The initiative of the State of Cambodia's government is an active contribution to quickly ending conflicts in Southeast Asia. It is important that all sides now show realistic policies and a readiness to make appropriate contributions.

For its part, the Soviet Union will continue efforts aimed at promoting this process.

UN Role in Solution Backed

BK1712073989 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1230 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] As part of his trip to a number of countries in Southeast Asia, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Igor Rogachev visited Cambodia and Thailand. As has been reported, a major issue discussed during talks in Phnom Penh and Bangkok was the solution to the Cambodian problem. Our commentator Comrade Oleg Shchedrov writes.

There is no doubt that it was the recent statement by Comrade Chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers Hun Sen which really influenced the essence of the talks. I would like to recall that in an interview granted to SPK [State of Cambodia's news agency], the head of the Cambodian Government for the first time disclosed that the United Nations could take an extensive part in solving the Cambodian problem if Cambodia's seat in this organization is left vacant. This seat is currently occupied by representatives of the opposing alliance. Comrade Hun Sen specifically pointed out the principled possibility of following the Namibia formula in which the United Nations assumes the role of supervising the situation in the country and the general election. Comrade Hun Sen did not give details of his proposal. He only appealed for the convening, as quickly as possible, of a consultation with all parties in Jakarta to discuss this issue and the composition and the main organizations to be set up.

Comrade Hun Sen's proposal was a most resolute breakthrough in the cause of a solution to the Cambodian problem since the beginning of negotiations among confronting groups and following the complete withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia. If this proposal can be implemented, it will in fact eliminate a major difference between the opposing sides. However, one should be cautious because the opposition immediately rejected the proposal to leave Cambodia's UN seat, which it is occupying, vacant. In my view, the inclusion of the United Nations into a solution to the Cambodian problem is important in other aspects as well, continues our commentator Comrade Oleg Shchedrov. It is not a secret that confronting forces in Cambodia receive support from a number of states. Experience has shown that an internal conflict always carries the risk of spreading into an international one, dragging in outside forces as well. This is not a light matter for Cambodia. This is why the participation of the United Nations will certainly create an appropriate atmosphere for mutual trust to avoid eventual negative consequences.

Comrade Hun Sen's proposal has drawn great attention in international circles. The statement of the U.S. Department of State also mentioned this. While in the Soviet Union, the statement issued by the Foreign Ministry clearly expressed support for Comrade Hun Sen's initiative. The Soviet Foreign Ministry pointed out that the Cambodian Government head's proposal has provided a favorable possibility to move step by step toward a comprehensive solution to the Cambodian problem. The remaining most difficult points should be solved through contributions of ideas to achieve fruition. The essence of this matter is international assistance as exemplified by Comrade Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev's trip to regional countries.

Rogachev Comments on Talks

LD1612180789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Cambodian problem and ways of solving it were the topic of discussions that took place during consultations between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of Cambodia and the Soviet Union. Comrade Rogachev, deputy USSR minister of foreign affairs, spoke to our correspondent about the results of the talks.

[Begin Rogachev recording] Recently, various countries and governments have made various proposals aimed at accelerating the process of a Cambodian settlement, of a comprehensive political settlement. I have in mind the proposals made by Thailand's Prime Minister Chatchai Chunhawan, Australia's Foreign Minister Mr Evans, and a number of other governments. Of course, Soviet diplomats too have had something to say on this.

In my opinion, the 2 days of consultations, had very, very weighty and perceptible results. Comrade Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of Cambodia, gave a new and important statement in which he backed the latest initiative from Thailand and Australia. Our Cambodian comrades are talking about the necessity for, and possibility of, strengthening the role of the United Nations in the Cambodian settlement process. All these matters were discussed at the consultations between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs. We signed a protocol, an intergovernmental protocol, here, under which the Soviet Union is to open a consulate general in the very near future in one of the largest of Cambodia's ports, Kampong Som. We have also signed a 2-year plan of cooperation between the Ministries of Foreign Affairs of the Soviet Union and Cambodia.

Near East & South Asia

Text of Gorbachev Message to Algerian President

PM1512143789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Mikhail Gorbachev congratulations to Algerian president on reelection]

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Chadli Benjedid, Algerian president and chairman of the Algerian National Liberation Front [FLN]:

Please accept our cordial congratulations on your reelection to the high post of chairman of the Algerian FLN party, with which the CPSU has good relations.

On behalf of the CPSU Central Committee and on my own behalf I wish you, Mr President, and all the new FLN party leadership successes in your activity for the good of the friendly Algerian people, and for the cause of peace, democracy, and social progress.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Bessmertnykh Meets UN Envoys on Afghanistan

LD0812052589 Moscow TASS in English 1917 GMT 7 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh today met Benon Sevan, personal envoy of the U.N. secretary general, and U.S. Assistant Secretary-General Jean Domenico Picco.

They told Bessmertnykh about the efforts of the U.N. secretary general to achieve a comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan in accordance with consensus resolutions of the U.N. General Assembly on Afghanistan.

The sides discussed the U.N. role in the Afghan settlement and ways to achieve such a settlement.

Kabul Reports Wakil-Shevardnadze Moscow Meeting

LD1512181689 Kabul Domestic Service in Pashto 1530 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Yesterday [14 December], during his visit to Moscow, Afghan Foreign Minister 'Abdul Wakil met with Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze. During the meeting, the present state of and prospects for further activity related to external aspects of the issue of Afghanistan was discussed.

The Afghan foreign minister, speaking about the development of the situation following the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, stressed that the Government of the Republic of Afghanistan headed by esteemed President Najibullah, has consolidated its position further with the decisive support of the people of Afghanistan. The struggle against foreign interference is continuing successfully. The process of the commanders inside the country joining the state is continuing. While maintaining the humanitarian policy of national reconciliation, the state expands dialogue with the representatives of the internal and external opposition.

Eduard Shevardnadze informed the Afghan foreign minister about the discussion of the Afghanistan issue during the meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and the United States which took place off the shore of Malta. Eduard Shevardnadze also informed the Afghan foreign minister about his meeting in Rome with Mohammad Zahir, former king of Afghanistan.

'Abdul Wakil expressed thanks on behalf of the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan for the political, moral, and other assistance of the Soviet Union to the people of Afghanistan at this difficult and sensitive time.

Afghan Rebel Leader Returns to Pakistan

LD1512221389 Moscow TASS in English 1916 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Islamabad December 15 TASS—"President" of the "Afghan interim government" Sebghatullah Mojaddedi has returned to Pakistan after a long trip to the United States.

Mojaddedi expressed "satisfaction" with his talks with U.S. President George Bush, at a news conference in Peshawar.

He said that the United States had promised to continue financial, military and political support to the rebels. The U.S. congress earmarked 700 million dollars in aid to the armed opposition for 1990.

Mojaddedi also expressed hope that a "broad-based mujahidin government" would be created in Afghanistan soon, in which the leaders of the Iran-based "Alliance of the Eight" would be represented.

Commentary Views Iran-Pakistan Border Talks

NC1612104289 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Iran's Interior Minister Mr 'Abdollah Nuri has stated that Iran intends to close its borders with Pakistan to those Afghan refugees who are involved in drug smuggling. During the regular talks between Iran and Pakistan in Zahedan, the relevant agreement on this was reached between the two sides. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes on this:

Currently, on the basis of various assessments, there are between 2-3 million Afghan refugees in Iran. Their presence in Iran creates a series of complicated political, economic, and national problems. However, Tehran has been facing the criminal aspects of the Afghanistan problem more and more during recent years. The problem is that the leadership of the unreconciling opposition considers Iran a market for drug distribution or a depot from which it can dispatch drugs to other countries.

The very close link between Afghan insurgents and drug smuggling has become a clear fact to everyone. The leaders of the so-called mujahedin are involved in both the wholesale and retail of large quantities of drugs and are thus pocketing millions in profits. Observers believe that about 600 tonnes of various drugs are produced each year in the areas under the insurgents' control.

Meanwhile, addiction is gradually becoming the number one problem faced by all the Middle East countries. For example, on the basis of official figures there are about 1 million addicts in Iran. This problem has adopted such a dimension that the government had to introduce an extraordinary law calling for the execution of drug smugglers.

Tehran newspapers point out that the so-called Afghan mujahedin form a large part of the drug smugglers. For example KAYHAN INTERNATIONAL recently wrote that more than 300 Afghan smugglers were arrested in various parts of Iran.

One can understand why the Iranian officials have resorted to strict measures in order to change the situation. First of all, they have tried to establish cooperation with Pakistan, which is the major base for heroin exports in the world. In mid-November, Iran's interior minister met with his Pakistani counterpart to discuss the problem of addiction. Both countries agreed on the need to begin a joint and extensive campaign against drug smugglers and to exchange information on the channels used by the big smugglers of white death on the borders.

The agreement between Iran and Pakistan on the formation of joint security posts on the two countries' borders was the next step. According to this decision, patrol groups have been formed along the Iranian-Pakistani border to fight the smugglers and armed bands.

Iran has gone one step ahead now and has announced its decision to close its borders with Pakistan on Afghan refugees. We wish to recall that the Iranian Majlis recently rejected a bill on relocating Afghan refugees in camps and on controlling them. But facts show that the government does not intend to retreat.

Hard times for the drug smugglers who belong to the unreconciling Afghan opposition appear to lie ahead.

East Europe

Yakovlev Visits GDR, Meets Gysi, Modrow

LD1612154989 Moscow TASS in English 1520 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—At the invitation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, stayed here on a working visit on December 14-15.

He met with Gregor Gysi, the SED chairman, Hans Modrow, prime minister of the GDR coalition government and deputy chairman of the party, Hans-Joachim Willerding, member of the SED Presidium, and representatives of the public.

During an exchange of views with Gregor Gysi, it was stressed that both sides are interested in enhancing inter-party cooperation on a new basis, in conditions when the two countries and the two parties are going through the process of renewal. It was noted that the process of renewal of society creates a sound basis for relations between the CPSU and the SED, even though there are natural differences in the specificity of domestic conditions in each country and diverse specific approaches and solutions, forms and methods of work.

Questions of interstate relations and prospects for socio-economic development were the focus of discussion at Yakovlev's meeting with Modrow. The complex nature of tasks facing the republic, the emotional charge of the past few weeks and the difficult legacy of the past does not negate the facts of undoubted achievements of the GDR, its contribution to European normalisation and the common European process.

Specific issues of interaction at the international arena were discussed by Yakovlev and Hans-Joachim Willerding.

Yakovlev briefed the German comrades on the pace of perestroyka in the Soviet Union, on the work of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the December 1989 plenum of the CPSU CC [Central Committee].

The talks showed that for its stable development the GDR needs progress in many areas—the support of the renewal process by the mass of the people, the dialogue and consensus of any realistically- minded, responsible forces and movements, respect for the GDR sovereignty and deep awareness by all those interested in the advance of the idea of common European cooperation of the significance of the GDR's sovereign status for the preservation of necessary conditions which ensure the construction of the common European home.

It was stressed that the political core of everything that is connected with the issue of German-German relations is in how undivided it is from the situation in Europe and the world. The GDR has long become a major factor not only of European but also of world politics. Reforms that were started in the republic can stabilise relations in a broader context as well. This stabilising role should be preserved in future as well, for the benefit of all Germans. The two states of one nation represent a viable alternative of developdment, which is open for broad cooperation and rapprochement. It can be carried out in the framework and in the process of building a common European home which rules out any backward movement. Its realisation should be free from political mongering, and permeated with deep and responsible policy, awareness of the interests of all European peoples.

2d Phase of SED Extraordinary Congress Reported

Gorbachev Greets Congress

PM1812102589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Message from USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Gorbachev "To the Delegates of the SED Extraordinary Congress"]

[Text] Dear comrades,

Your congress is completing its work, clearing room for the activity of the renewed party and thus opening a new page in the history of the German Democratic Republic.

The heated debates and drastic decisions of the past few weeks, perhaps, are not only explainable but also logical. Much of what had been accumulating for years and could not find a way out has now splashed out in a cleansing storm.

What has happened was bound to happen. We Soviet Communists know from our own experience that life cannot be placed in the chains of dogmas.

Lack of faith in the people and in the creative energy of the masses leads to a fall in confidence in the party and thus to the erosion of its role of a political vanguard.

Practice has shown more than once that socialism does not bear gaps between words and deeds and between politics and morals.

The administrative-command system, stifling any initiative from below and drying out the sources of people's wisdom, is harmful for it.

Lies, a dual morality, let alone graft and lawlessness, have always been poisonous to socialism.

The strength of the stem of social justice is in overcoming the alienation of working people from property, power and culture, in establishing and constantly developing democracy.

The essence of Soviet perestroyka is the creation of conditions for revealing the potential of every personality and the turning of man into the maker of his own destiny.

You and we seem to be setting ourselves similar aims. The CPSU (Soviet Communist Party) appreciates your clearly-expressed sympathy and support for our perestroyka.

Embarking on the road of the consolidation of advocates of democratic socialism on German soil, you can be sure of our solidarity.

The German Democratic Republic emerged from the flame of the anti-fascist struggle as a response to the criminal policy that had led to the national catastrophe, as the expression of the firm will and desire to prevent the threat to peace in Europe and the whole world from ever coming from Germany.

You have contributed to the peace in Europe that has been reigning on the continent for 44 years now. If we are all witnessing the rolling back of the "cold war," then it is because its waves broke against your frontiers, too.

The appearance of clear outlines of the construction of a common European home, in which all peoples will live as one big family, has become possible due to the recognition of the existing realities and the readiness to place common interests above one's own.

The good changes in Europe would have been just impossible without the GDR or contrary to its will.

The establishment of your republic took place in difficult conditions. You and your friends had to undergo many trials.

Although there were mistakes in their work, two generations of communists did not work and struggle in vain, devoting their energy and aspirations to the righteous cause.

Now the German Democratic Republic is acquiring a new quality both as a state and a society. We know from our own experience that such a transition is at once promising, challenging and risky.

We understand the extent of the political responsibility that has been placed on the party's shoulders in the current situation.

Having disassociated itself from everything that has been discarded by the development, having radically renewed the organisation from top to bottom and formulated policy objectives that are close to the masses, your party has grounds for being a vanguard force of the republic.

We sincerely wish you success in implementing the decisions taken by the congress for the benefit of the GDR, in the name of just social ideals, and in the interests of friendship between our countries and peoples and durable peace and stability in Europe.

The CPSU is open for cooperation with you. It is ready to build our mutual relations on the basis of friendship and comradeship, respect for one another's views, and adherence to common ideological and political values.

With communist greetings,
M. Gorbachev

SED's 'Stalinist' Past Criticized

LD1612181289 Moscow TASS in English 1515 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—The extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) continued its work in Berlin today. The first phase of the congress was held on December 8-9.

At the opening of the session Wolfgang Berghofer, SED deputy chairman, read out a message of greetings from the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, signed by Mikhail Gorbachev, to the delegates to the congress.

More than 2,500 delegates who gathered in Berlin's Dynamo Sports Palace will hear a report on the historical roots of the crisis in the German Democratic Republic and on SED responsibility and a report on the grievances commission, the purpose of which is, in particular, to carry on the investigation of instances of violation of party rules and other abuses on the part of SED functionaries.

The delegates will consider a draft new programme and draft party rules. At the end of the day they are expected to decide on a new name for the party.

A report entitled "On Crisis in Society and on Its Causes and on SED Responsibility" was delivered at the congress by Professor Michael Schumann.

He pointed out that Erich Honecker and his entourage became increasingly isolated from the bulk of party members and from the people as a whole. "Rejecting Soviet perestroyka and glasnost, they advanced a 'socialism in the GDR colours' slogan. Nowadays the past period should be described as 'Stalinism in the GDR colours'", Schumann said.

The leadership headed by Egon Krenz did not have a clear concept and proved unable to finally break away from the past, he added:

"The party as a political organisation failed to independently launch a restructuring process and to understand at once the character of the renewal process. This is why it found itself in such a position that it now has to struggle for survival.

"In future we should more profoundly analyse the causes of the emergence of the Stalinist way of thinking and events in our country after its liberation from fascism and point to deformations they entailed.

"Conclusions drawn from the analysis and aimed at preventing such deformations in future should be sealed in a programme and rules of the party and find reflection in a new approach to our own history, the approach which would be free from apologetics and embellishments," Schumann said.

It was decided at the congress to set up a special group of advisers to the party chairman. The group that would help him by word and deed is to consist of about 20 party veterans.

Among candidacies suggested for work in the group of advisers are Ruth Werner, Stephan Hermlin, Jurgen Kuczynski, Markus Wolf, Moritz Moebel and others.

SED 'Parting Company' With Stalinism

LD1612180689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0630 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] The Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] extraordinary congress continued in Berlin today. The first part of the congress took place a week earlier. Our special correspondents Viktor Levin and (Anatoliy Sterkin) report:

[Levin] Over the past few days each of us has managed to talk to many GDR citizens belonging to various political forces. Facts of corruption among the former leaders have created an impression of shock on everyone, but serious people understand that this is a consequence of the Stalinist system, something created by it. However, there are many citizens today who identify the SED with that system. The party has found within itself the strength to begin a decisive break from the past, but it still must win the trust of the people. What servile theorists in the past called trust was in reality subservience stemming from fear of punishment. Now it can be a matter only of genuine trust, and the party must try to win it in extremely difficult conditions.

[(Sterkin)] New political parties are now growing up in the GDR like mushrooms after a rain. A week ago a roundtable assembled representatives of 14 parties and public organizations. It is said that there are now more than 20. I am not sure that they will all stand the test of time, or concrete actions, but each of these parties has one considerable advantage over the five parties that existed before. This advantage is that they are not in any way touched by any guilt for the fact that the GDR is politically seriously demoralized, economically indebted, and morally depressed as a result of the facts that have been revealed about the corruption of former leaders.

[Levin] A new start is needed, the SED announces. We are decisively breaking away from the past, other parties say, too. And much is already changing. The National Front has fallen apart; it used to be a quintet in which the SED was both the conductor and the first violin. Each party is seeking its own image.

[(Sterkin)] Yesterday, at the GDR's CDU [Christian Democratic Union] emergency congress, it was stated that this party would operate quite independently, that it has its own views about what a law-governed state should be like, and about how to ensure the supremacy of the law. The congress is continuing its work today, too, and we intend to report on it, for this approach is in accord with today's political realities in the GDR.

Another aspect of this reality is public opinion. This is marked not only by justified exactingness, but also, at times—and one must not close one's eyes to this—by the desire for revenge. In this connection, one should note that all social forces, including the church, are insistently calling for calm and self-possession, and condemn extremism.

[Levin] The GDR is going through a difficult time. A heavy burden has fallen to the SED. Even so, I think the party will be able to find its path into the future, and into people's hearts. It will do this because it does not fear cutting through the tangled knots and decisively parting company with Stalinist dogmas.

Former Leaders' Account of Crisis Noted

LD1612213489 Moscow TASS in English 1940 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—At the second phase of the congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED) here the delegates elected commissions for the elaboration of a new programme and new rules of the party.

They familiarised themselves with the former SED leadership's written account of the causes of the crisis in the party and society.

The account points out that the causes lie in a false concept of socialism and of the Marxist-Leninist party and its role in society.

"There is no collective guilt of the party members. But it would be also wrong to associate it only with the names of Erich Honecker and Guenther Mittag," the document emphasises.

"The fact is that members of the Politburo and the Central Committee as a whole violated party rules. None had courage enough to draw conclusions for themselves from the growing claims upon absolute power on the part of Honecker and Mittag and withdraw from the party leadership.

"Voluntarism in decisions of the party leadership arose in view of the fact that the party regarded itself as the implementer of laws.

"This determined its style of work and its claim to infallibility as well as the political system under which in the final analysis the party alone tackled the management and organisation of the economy and culture," the account says.

"Following the CPSU's 20th Congress," the account points out, "Stalinist policy in the GDR, just as in other socialist countries, was not raised on the plea of the severity of class struggle at the height of the 'cold war.'"

"A great error with respect to party members was made: they were deprived of the right to vote, expelled from the party and even subjected to repression.

"Contradictions between the leadership and rank and file members of the party particularly intensified after the SED's 11th Congress. A reassessment of values occurred in the people's minds, not in favour of SED. An acceptance of the policy of restructuring would inevitably signify a public recognition of the failure of the economic policy.

"The former Politburo is also responsible for the fact that the press, radio and television of the GDR less and less accorded with the Leninist precept to be a critical defender of the working people and thereby the organiser of socialist transformations," the document emphasises.

Werner Eberlein, chairman of the party control commission, in his report presented to the delegates to the congress, said that on November 16 he had a talk with Honecker who read out a statement and "fully recognised his responsibility for the obtaining situation."

The former SED leader said that the causes of his incorrect decisions were in the fact that he "took a wrong view of life in the country, yielding to assurances that he received during his tours of the country."

During the talk with Eberlein, Honecker said that he "favours a renewal of society as is formulated in the SED action programme but has increasing doubts as to whether the process develops in the right direction."

The Central Auditing Commission admits its errors, says a report presented to the delegates. Its activities "fit into the party's managerial work, which did a considerable damage to both the party and society. The Central Auditing Commission did not fully justify the hopes associated with it, although it did not sanction or cover up cases of abuse, immoral and criminal actions with regard to party members," the commission's report said.

Fifteen delegates took part in the debate on the report entitled "On Crisis in Society and Its Causes and on SED Responsibility." The report was adopted as a working document.

It was announced that the former Central Auditing Commission of the SED is dissolved in view of the election of the grievances commission.

SED Changes Name

LD1612215789 Moscow TASS in English 2131 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—At the current extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), it was decided on Saturday to change the party's name.

It will now be called the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism (SED-PDS).

Gysi Gives Report; Congress Ends

LD1712223489 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondents Aleksey Korinenko and Vadim Chudov:

The extraordinary congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-the Party of Democratic Socialism (SUPG-PDS) concluded its work here on Sunday.

The overwhelming majority of more than 2,500 delegates favoured the addition to the name of the party of the definition specifying the essence of the renewed party policy.

Gregor Gysi reported on the immediate tasks of the SUPG-PDS. The political and calendar landmarks for next year are the statutory congress of the party and the elections scheduled for May 6, he pointed out. The election campaign has already begun and the historic day of May 6 is the determinant for the activity of all parties and movements in the country.

At present, Gysi said, the party membership amounts to 1.7 million people. The party will organise its work on territorial as well as production principles, but its organisations in the state bodies and the units of the Armed Forces will be disbanded.

The political system of the German Democratic Republic is becoming increasingly pluralized, but it can become dependable only if and when it is guaranteed by the Constitution. A new constitution and a radically new view upon the separation of powers must be worked out for the purpose.

Gysi spoke in detail about the normalisation of the industries and agriculture of the German Democratic Republic and stressed the need for a radical economic reform. The SUPG-PDS favours a policy of prices and subsidies that can counteract wastefulness and profiteering. It considers [it] necessary to pay socially just compensation to families with many children, pensioners and low-income workers.

Proceeding to international relations, Gysi stated that the Stalinist model of socialism did harm not only to the internal policy of the German Democratic Republic, but also to its prestige in the world.

The alliance with the Soviet Union, he stressed, is a matter of foreign and economic policy relating to the existence of the German Democratic Republic. At present there is a chance to create a community with the Soviet Union in matters of security and values on a new basis. The SUPG-PDS reiterates its allegiance to the community within the Warsaw Treaty framework, while favouring its politicization and democratization.

Pointing out the fact of existence of the two German states, Gregor Gysi stressed that this fact is a guarantor of securing peace and stability in Europe.

Proceeding from the existence of the German question as a European issue, it is necessary to support respect for the borders that appeared after 1945 as a result of a war unleashed by the Germans. The future of the Germans is viewed as being within a common Europe. This is why there is a need to create partnership between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany in the field of security.

It is deemed possible to establish a contractual community; history will then show whether this community can be confederative in character.

Following a report by the commission for working out the new party rules, presented by Deputy Chairman of the Party Wolfgang Pohl, delegates approved by a majority the draft rules submitted by the commission. It will be effective until the next regular congress of the party.

The congress approved the programme theses outlining the position of the party concerning the major matters of the life of the party and society.

The congress adopted an appeal to party members presenting the position of the SUPG-PDS, including the forthcoming general elections scheduled for May next year.

SED's Gysi Gives Interviews to Soviet Media

On FRG, USSR Ties, Public's View of SED

LD1712152989 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1230 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Interview with Gregor Gysi, chairman of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany-Party of Democratic Socialism (SED-PDS), by correspondent Vyachelsav Mostovoy in

Berlin; date of interview not given—recorded; questions and answers in German with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Announcer] Esteemed comrades, as you know, during the first stage of the SED's [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] extraordinary congress, Gregor Gysi was elected chairman of the party. Vyacheslav Mostovoy, correspondent of Soviet television, is in conversation with him:

[Mostovoy] Comrade Gysi, what were the reasons, in your view, that led the party to such a crisis situation?

[Gysi] After the unifying congress in 1946, at which the SED was formed, the traditions of social democracy were cast aside too quickly, in my view, and Stalinist structures were adopted both inside and outside the party. These centralist-administrative structures finally led to a crisis. From the beginning of the revolutionary transformations in the Soviet Union in 1985, my party, too, had the opportunity in this period to cary out analogous transformations in the GDR. However, the party leadership did not take advantage of it. It hindered perestroyka, and by doing so facilitated the deepening of the crisis situation that existed even then. This is the main reason for the crisis situation; indeed, it is the most important reason. During the work of the extraordinary congress a report will be made on the reasons for the crisis. Its roots go back deep into history. But I will dwell on this in our conversation now, since to do otherwise might sound unscientific.

[Mostovoy] Comrade Gysi, what do you think the population of the GDR expects from the party? What steps can lead the SED out of the crisis situation and bring back the confidence of the people, taking into account the elections in May 1990?

[Gysi] I would like to say that we need to win the confidence of the people, but the expression bring back sounds problematic at the present time. We will succeed in doing this only if the party carries out a radical renewal, definitively starts on the path to democracy and, at the same time, makes it quite clear that it remains a socialist party, that the most important thing for it is social justice and social guarantees. And if the party achieves stability, then it will become clear to everyone that it is capable of implementing its aims and program to such a degree as to be the leading party—that is, capable of forming a government. In the final analysis, it is a question of this very thing at the elections.

[Mostovoy] Why was the decision made to change the structure of the party's leading bodies?

[Gysi] All the names [of the party's leading bodies] that existed before smacked of command centralism. For that reason we bid a final farewell to these concepts and chose terms that we, at any rate, consider to be more democratic and which clearly reflect the renewal of the party. But this is our decision and it has no relation to other parties. We perceive this name as more appropriate and as very clearly underscoring the renewal.

[Mostovoy] You think that these measures should to some extent guarantee protection against corruption and abuse of power?

[Gysi] This will not be achieved by a change of names alone. It is also necessary to change the structure. But, on the other hand, these new names do change the structure. This is a process that we must work on. The apparat must acquire new tasks and must be reduced. It should organize the preelection struggle, the link between the mass of the party and the election bodies, and, if necessary, also ensure the link with scientific workers, with the artistic intelligentsia, and with all layers of society so the new leadership can develop and work out a program, taking into account their interests and views.

[Mostovoy] How do you see the future of the GDR?

[Gysi] I see the GDR continuing in the future as a sovereign and independent state that maintains close and fraternal relations with the Soviet Union, with neighboring countries, and also with the FRG. We are striving to achieve a contractual association with the FRG and with West Berlin, which should ensure as many cooperative links in politics, economics, science, and culture as possible but which must not lead to a limitation of the sovereignty of the two states, since limitation of sovereignty may cause undesirable phenomena and lead to an unacceptable destabilization in Europe.

[Mostovoy] In your view, how should relations between the SED and the CPSU develop at the present stage, and what is your assessment of the prospects for cooperation between the USSR and the GDR?

[Gysi] As for relations between our parties, I proceed from the premise that exchange of experience should now be even deeper and more regular. So far, the situation has been quite complex because the CPSU was in a process of revolutionary perestroyka, which it was organizing, and my party was attempting to prevent such a process. And I think that since 1985 a real exchange of experience could not be carried out. We would, of course, like to learn from the CPSU's experience, but we do not wish to copy it, so that we can avoid certain mistakes in the perestroyka process.

On the other hand, we could use important discoveries that are useful for us. It is also possible that we shall be able to transfer some experience to you. That is, it must be a mutually useful process. But with regard to relations between the states, I proceed from the premise that economic cooperation has great significance for both countries. It is important that treaties that have been concluded are implemented. For us, the Soviet Union is a very important supplier of raw materials and I believe that machinery and other goods from the GDR are also of some significance for the Soviet economy. We must strengthen this cooperation and make it more effective, more flexible.

At present everything is too bureaucratic, too complex. In my view, a great deal could be simplified in order to strengthen direct links between enteprises. Of course, treaties on the basis of the state should be retained. We should pay for oil with machinery, and the governments should reach agreement on this. But, on the other hand, I see splendid opportunities for joint enterprises to more successfully assimilate the markets of third countries, instead of restricting ourselves merely to our internal markets as has been the case for many years, something which has proven itself to be economically inefficient.

[Mostovoy] Comrade Gysi, you are to visit the Soviet Union in the near future. What are your expectations of this visit?

[Gysi] The main thing is that we shall probably take a marked step forward in the matter of exchanging experience, deepening cooperation, and simplifying relations between our states. And, of course, I should very much like to get to know Comrade Gorbachev. It is very important for me, and I know from comrades who have already held conversations with him how interesting he is to talk to, and I would not wish to raise an obstacle to this. I think that personal acquaintance is of great significance. He has experience in the matter of perestroyka which he can certainly tell me about. I am very interested in this.

[Mostovoy] You spoke to him on Sunday, didn't you?

[Gysi] Yes, we spoke on the telephone. It was a very interesting and specific discussion and we were in absolute agreement on the issue of preserving the GDR's sovereignty for the stability and security of Europe.

[Mostovoy] Now some questions of a personal nature. Why did you choose the profession of lawyer?

[Gysi] As a matter of fact, I did not know what I should study and someone then advised me to study jurisprudence, which is what I did. And, as it turned out, it was a good choice for my life. But when I began to study I could not have contemplated this in any way at all.

[Mostovoy] But you do not regret it now?

[Gysi] I had a fine profession before being elected party chairman. I was a lawyer. I was always happy in my work, I was interested in it. Now I bear a great political responsibility which I could not have imagined in my life, since I was not closely involved in politics. And I shall remain a lawyer in the future when I am no longer carrying out these new functions.

I think it is very proper for the party chairman to be able—if circumstances require it—to return to his profession. There will be no social or moral difficulties if this takes place easily. I believe that one can occupy the lofty position which I now hold only out of a sense of political responsibility, and no other motives should determine that choice.

[Mostovoy] In which year did you join the party?

[Gysi] In 1967.

[Mostovoy] Did you join the party when you were still at the university?

[Gysi] Yes.

[Mostovoy] What party positions have you held over that time?

[Gysi] I was in the party committee of the law faculty at Humboldt University. I also performed duties in the lawyers' collegium. Then I was secretary of that organization. I have not had any other party positions. I have never worked in the party apparatus; I have never been a member of a party area [rayon] or district [okrug] committee. And, of course, I have never worked at the Central Committee either. Perhaps this was of assistance, precisely, in my now having been elected party chairman.

[Mostovoy] Did your joining the party result from your father's influence?

[Gysi] Undoubtedly. My joining the party was conditioned by my family, by my upbringing. My parents were active party members even before 1945. They were officially acknowledged as wanted persons under fascism and they were fighters against fascism. So, of course, my parents influenced my views.

[Mostovoy] What do your children do?

[Gysi] My eldest son is a typesetter on the paper NEUES DEUTSCHLAND, and he criticizes me if I do not describe his specialization correctly. My second son is still a student. He has been studying so far for the profession of automobile metal worker. We shall see what job he will do in the future. He will take his final exams in February.

[Mostovoy] Have you been to the Soviet Union?

[Gysi] Yes, of course.

[Mostovoy] What were your impressions?

[Gysi] In the Soviet Union I have visited Moscow, Minsk, Bratsk, Irkutsk, Bukhara, Samarkand, and Dushanbe. That is what I can recall now. These were mainly private trips during my vacations or short business trips. Once I went on the invitation of some Moscow lawyers. That was interesting too. The hospitality of Soviet people has always impressed me very much and I liked the friendliness with which we were received. Soviet people have many of the qualities which I value highly. This is why I have great affection for your people.

[Mostovoy] Thank you very much for the interview, Comrade Gysi. Allow me to wish you great success in the post of party chairman.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA Interview

WA1512205589 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 50, 13 Dec 89 p 9

[Report on interview with SED Chairman Gregor Gysi by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA special correspondent Oleg Bitov and TASS correspondent Igor Osinskiy in Berlin on 10 December: "Gregor Gysi: We Are Trying To Make Up for What Was Neglected"; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction, paragraphs 11-16 are editorial note]

[Text] Gregor Gysi, who was elected leader of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany], is a totally new personality on the political horizon of the GDR. He is 41 years old. He graduated from the legal faculty of Humboldt University in Berlin and worked as an aide to judges. He has been a lawyer since 1971, speaking on a broad range of questions concerning criminal, family, civil, labor, and administrative legislation. He has an academic degree. For the last 2 years he has headed the Berlin board of barristers. An interesting feature: Several days ago it was he who represented the interests of the opposition organization "New Forum" in its official registration in the organs of internal affairs...

We met with G. Gysi on Sunday, the day after a recess was called in the work of the SED extraordinary congress. To our great surprise, he agreed to come to the TASS office in Berlin and give a quick interview to LITERATURNAYA GAZETA.

[Correspondent] Regardless of political coloration, one observes a tendency in the GDR press recently somehow to dissociate oneself from and make a break with the past. Incidentally, this tendency also appears in the Soviet press. What do you think: Is it necessary to get rid of 100 percent of the past?

[Gysi] Old structures must be discarded decisively; they have become shackles on our legs. And we must preserve the social gains, develop them, and raise them to a level of genuine democracy, G. Gysi replied.

[Correspondent] Do you think that in the present situation the Soviet experience and the experience of the CPSU could be useful to you?

[Gysi] The process of renewal in the GDR became possible specifically owing to the reorganization in the Soviet Union. Starting in 1985 my party had a good chance to draw the necessary inferences from Soviet perestroyka. But, alas, we did not make them. This aggravated the situation and led to the fact that reorganization began in our country not from the top, but from below. A lot of valuable time has been lost. We are endeavoring to make up for what was neglected. And we feel ourselves closely associated with the CPSU, which actually embodies revolutionary transformations. Those comrades with whom I now work assess the activity of M.S. Gorbachev very highly, as well as his courage and consistency.

[Correspondent] And have you had occasion of late to talk with Soviet leaders?

[Gysi] I was also asked this very question by Western journalists. I answered that I still have not had an opportunity even to go to the telephone—I will not deny that there have been telephone calls from Moscow. I would like very much to exchange views with M.S. Gorbachev.

[Correspondent] One more question that is being actively discussed in our countries today: If the SED is the party of the working class, then why is the voice of the intelligentsia heard loudest of all in discussions about its fate?

[Gysi] It is not possible to separate the intelligentsia from the workers. This has always led to tragedies, and it served as a basis for which enmity grew toward the representatives of intellectual labor. And then the intelligentsia does not exist in a pure form; it is tied by thousands of strings, visible and invisible, to all layers of society. How to achieve an organic confluence of their interests—that is the question...

...Several words about the events that preceded this interview.

The SED extraordinary congress was to have been held a week later. But the position of the party has worsened so swiftly that it was decided to convene it immediately; moreover, it opened at night. Indeed they were counting in hours.

The extraordinary congress must answer Hamlet's question: To be or not to be? The fate not only of the party, but actually of the entire GDR—the fate of socialism on German soil—depends on the decisions the delegates reach.

It is still too early to talk about the results of the congress. In 17 hours of intensive work the delegates succeeded in considering the internal political situation in the republic and to elect a new leadership of the party. And after that the congress took a week's time-out so the delegates would be able to visit their own districts and learn the opinions of the rank and file communists.

The administration of the party (and there is virtually not one member of the old Central Committee on the staff—a fact that is more than very significant) announced that it intends to bring about a full break with "the bankrupt administrative-centralist socialism." "We will come out of the crisis in which our country finds itself only if we choose a third way that has nothing in common either with Stalinist socialism or with the capitalist system of exploitation," said Gregor Gysi. It is his difficult destiny to head the party at a time that is most critical for it...

...A small detail: The new SED leader literally simply "dropped by" the Berlin office of TASS—without the retinue and even without the security that was usual for his predecessors. He held himself without official aplomb, with dignity and in a comradely way, but without familiarity. He did not arrive in a Mercedes and not in a Volvo, but in an ordinary Lada. And he left on foot: The visit was so unexpected and unusual that even correspondents of leading world agencies, newspapers, and journals who were "hunting for" G. Gysi that evening did not recognize the party leader in this simple person.

We asked our last question: "What are your near-term plans in what is a new career for you?"

[Gysi] Let us wait until the end of the congress.

GDR's Christian Democrats Hold Congress

LD1612181789 Moscow TASS in English 1608 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—The Christian Democratic Union (CDU) of the German Democratic Republic continued its extraordinary congress in Berlin on Saturday. The delegates elected by majority Lothar de Maiziere as chairman of the CDU. Maiziere was CDU chairman since November 10 by the decision of the party's chief board.

The delegates endorsed the CDU chairman's report which he made at the opening of the congress and adopted a new party charter. In addition, they endorsed information on the activity of the chief board after the previous, 16th congress and debated the programme objectives of the CDU and its social concept.

The decision by Winfried Wolk, member of the chief board, to quit the CDU came as a major surprise at the congress. He accused the congress of being too passive in overcoming the mistakes of the past. He said the GDR is on the verge of catastrophe. For a long time the CDU was "the tool of SUPG" [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] and was not a real party.

The congress was addressed by West Berlin's CDU chief Eberhard Diepgen who expressed interest in stabilising the situation in the GDR. He said the current developments in the country set the stage for a just, humane social system. The speaker stressed the need for stability in relations between the two German states.

West Berlin's Christian Democratic Union said in a press release that Diepgen suggested creating a joint committee with the GDR's Christian Democratic Union which will discuss forms of cooperation between the two parties.

Diepgen told journalists that the committee should complement a regional commission, set up at the initiative of West Berlin's Mayor Walter Momper and his GDR counterpart Erhard Krack.

The delegates elected Martin Kirchner general secretary of the CDU.

GDR's Democratic Awakening Party Holds Congress

LD1612183789 Moscow TASS in English 1644 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Berlin December 16 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Osinskiy:

The Democratic Breakthrough [Democratic Awakening] Party opened its founding congress in Leipzig on Saturday. It is attended by some 300 delegates from across the German Democratic Republic.

The new party, which is only one month old, was set up in Berlin on October 30 and is believed to have 8,000 to 16,000 members, who include members of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Social Democrats, Christians, workers, intellectuals and craftsmen.

Yesterday the local newspaper LEIPZIGER VOLKSZEITUNG published the party's draft programme. It says that the GDR should work to prevent war and provide a democratic alternative to the capitalist Federal Republic of Germany.

Democratic Breakthrough advocates free elections on the basis of secret ballot, separation of the state from the party, the elimination of monopoly on information and public control over the state.

In the economy, Democratic Breakthrough favours transition to a market-oriented system which will aim to ensure a high standard of living and ecologically safe production.

The congress will last two days.

CSSR Leaders To Visit Moscow 'This Week'

LD1812094289 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] It has been announced in Prague that the prime minister of Czechoslovakia, Marian Calfa, and Foreign Minister Jiri Dienstbier will visit Moscow this week. The foreign minister said they intend to discuss the withdrawal of Soviet troops from their country. Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and other socialist countries have admitted that the introduction of the troops of the Warsaw Treaty countries into Czechoslovakia in 1968 was a violation of its sovereignty.

The Soviet Union is not against the withdrawal of the troops, provided the all-European balance and the security of the borders of all countries are preserved.

CPCZ Shadow Role in Government To End 31 Dec

LD1612212589 Moscow TASS in English 1650 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 16 TASS—Following the cancellation of Article Four of the Czechoslovak Constitution which enshrined the Czechoslovak Communist Party's leading role in society, bodies and organisations of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia stop their activities from December 31, 1989, in the Czechoslovak People's Army, border troops, Interior Ministry troops, in the National Security Corps, at the Procurator's Office, Ministry of Justice, state arbitrage, the People's Control Committee, the presidiums of federal and republican government and the office of the Czechoslovak president.

The Communist Party believes that the abovementioned bodies should have no organisational structures of any political parties and movements.

This statement was made at a meeting of the Presidium of the Czechoslovak Communist Party Central Committee on Friday night.

It adopted a provisional organisational charter which will remain in force until the next, 18th congress. The document stresses that the Czechoslovak Communist Party is a political party which functions within the Constitution and in accordance with the Czechoslovak laws.

The presidium relieved Zdenek Goreni of his duties as member of the Central Committee secretary and editor-in-chief of the newspaper RUDE PRAVO, at his request. Zdenek Porybny was appointed to the post of editor-in-chief.

CSSR Economy, Political System To Be Changed

LD1712173689 Moscow TASS in English 1545 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Prague December 17 TASS—By TASS correspondents Valeriy Rzhevskiy and Vitaliy Yaroshevskiy:

The Czechoslovak Communist Party abandoned monopoly on power and is now preparing for its special congress. Party organisations elected 1,618 delegates. Nearly 1,500 represent the working class and 116—workers at agricultural cooperatives.

A half of the delegates joined the party in 1971-1980. The Presidium of the Central Committee relieved Gustav Husak, Alois Indra, Jan Fojtik, Vasil Bilak, Karel Hoffmann, Josef Lenart and Miroslav Zavadil of their membership at the Central Committee.

The newspaper RUDE PRAVO offered its pages for the exchange of opinions between party members before the congress. Judging by articles published in the newspaper, many Communists consider the present Central Committee of the party weak and incapable of vigorous actions.

But this is not the case with the entire party. Relying on primary organisations, it seeks to plot a correct route and to pass the difficult period with a clear-cut action programme.

This is the only way for it to regain support, trust and prestige. All these trump cards are now enjoyed by the Civic Forum, which is working without letup. Saturday was no exception.

Opposition Leader Vaclav Havel met Italian Socialist Party leader Bettino Craxi and spoke on television. He said that the establishment of the Civic Forum and Public Against Violence movements is not a plot against communists.

The opposition leader spoke about the presidential elections and about his candidacy for the post. Havel put forth two conditions for his nomination.

Firstly, he would like to be a temporary president until general free elections in the middle of the next year. Secondly, he would like to work at any post together with Alexander Dubcek. To all appearances, Havel sees him in the role of vice president.

The Civic Forum Coordination Centre held a meeting of its representatives from regional branches. They discussed the political situation in Czechoslovakia and mapped out a strategy for the presidential election campaign.

Assessing the present situation in the country and sentiments of the greater part of society, one can draw the conclusion that the 53-year-old playwright has more chances for election than other runners—Ladislav Adamec, Alexander Dubcek and Cestmir Cisar.

The Civic Forum is conducting a hectic election campaign in the past few days. The Forum's experts surprised people with their unusual proposal on Saturday: to hold the presidential elections by a show of hands at the Federal Assembly which will be broadcast by television live.

Refusing confidence to the present parliamement, the opposition believes that parliament will docilely vote for its candidate. A live TV broadcast of a Federal Assembly sitting would make deputies prove their loyalty to the Civic Forum.

According to the forum, the presidential elections will mean the end of the first stage of transition to a democratic state. The opposition has been able to place its people at many key posts during this stage.

The Forum's representatives emphasised at a news conference on Saturday that they now intend to change the political and economic system.

CSSR Premier Calfa Discusses Economy

LD1712180589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0955 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From the "Countries of Socialism" program, includes video report by Sergey Andreyev from Czechoslovakia and video interview with CSSR Premier Marian Calfa: "Czechoslovakia at a Turning Point"; date, place of interview not given—recorded; Calfa speaks in Czech with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Andreyev] Marian Calfa, chairman of the Government of Czechoslovakia, 43 years old, a lawyer by training and a member of the Communist Party.

Comrade Calfa, to start with I would like to ask a question that may, perhaps, surprise you. There is so much going on today, so many important topical affairs. Tension can be felt within society. But I'd like to ask you how you see the Czechoslovakia of the future, your dream for Czechoslovakia, you could say.

[Calfa] I have a very precise idea about the future. I should very much like peoples and ethnic groups to live here together, for them to be content; for there to be prosperity and for democratic principles to reign; for people to have the chance to express their opinion and for society to respect that opinion; for there to be a politial culture and for us really to reach what we call a state based on law, a democratic state, a state of people who can think freely.

[Andreyev] I think this thought of yours is a very topical one because, in my opinion, there are examples today of how formalism, the old formalism of the bureaucracy, is now, in some extraordinary manner, being transformed on occasion into a formalism of democracy, and bureaucratic force is becoming democratic force. Are you aware of such instances? For example, do you believe a person can express his opinion even if it goes against Civic Forum?

[Calfa] The situation today is, naturally, a reaction to many years of a certain suppression of views, to many years of an official view, the only view, and a reaction to punishment in various ways of those people who did not share that view. The sharp reaction that occurred once this mechanism of suppression was no longer there is therefore understandable. I think all this is in accordance with the law that reaction follows action but it will, I hope, pass and we will return to our truly profoundly democratic traditions and to the play of political forces within the framework of the specific institutions and forms that operate within every civilised state.

[Andreyev] Political life, as is well known, is the superstructure. The basis is the economy. I think the government is also concerned about the latter. What can you tell us about the government's first steps, the programs that have been planned, the place cooperation with the Soviet Union will have in those programs, and how this should, in your opinion, develop?

[Calfa] The basis of the whole of life is, of course, the economy. A group of specialists with somewhat different views on dealing with economic issues and on introducing new economic models have become members of the government, the new government. They are people who have come from the Forecasting Institute, and they are united by specific notions about the development of the economy. We have prepared the introduction of a new economic mechanism as of 1 January and have drafted the appropriate norms for it. At the moment the entire economic mechanism that is in preparation is being investigated and analyzed in very great detail in order to—and no doubt it will—be amended, in the sense that traces of the method of leadership that is based on directives will be totally eliminated.

As for relations with the Soviet Union and cooperation with the Soviet economy, for us there is nothing that could replace them. Historically we are profoundly linked to the economy of the Soviet Union, and this relates particularly to the raw materials base of our industry and to the fuel and power base, to oil and gas. Supplies from the Soviet Union are vitally important to us. I think that on this basis, cooperation with the USSR will continue in the future. Understandably, qualitative development of the economic mechanism will require other forms of economic cooperation as well, not just the exchange of raw materials for finished goods, but higher forms of cooperation too, such as cooperatives, etc. It must, of course, be understood that no economy can develop purely on a bilateral basis. We would like, really, to open the doors to the European and international economies and to find our place in them on the basis of truly up-to-date forms of cooperation.

Urbanek Discusses Criticism of CPCZ

LD1712222289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" program; interview with Karel Urbanek, Czechoslovak Communist Party [CPCZ] general secretary, by A. Samylin in Bratislava on 17 December—recorded]

[Text] [Samylin] Critical remarks were levelled at this congress not only against the former leadership, but also against the present leadership.

[Urbanek] A heavy task has been laid on our sholders. The November plenum was very poorly prepared, particularly the question of cadres. Yes, and information about our decisions is still penetrating primary organizations with great difficulty. This is evident at this congress as well, which has been a dress rehearsal, as it were, prior to the congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia.

[Samylin] The situation is indeed difficult. Can one speak of optimism now?

[Urbanek] I have always been an optimist and will remain one.

[video shows congress hall, interview with Urbanek]

Slovak Communists' Emergency Congress Ends

LD1812094489 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Bratislava December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Igor Kuleshov:

The Communist Party of Slovakia (KSS) ended its emergency congress in Bratislava late at night.

After a heated debate the congress adopted an action programme which will be broadly discussed inside the party. The programme sets forth the general principles of the party's political course till its regular congress scheduled for the spring of 1990.

The party congress also adopted a package of measures to be implemented before the forthcoming congress.

In its resolution the congress suggested that a special commission be set up at the forthcoming congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia (KSC) to revise the document "Lessons of the Crisis Development in the Party and Society After the 13th Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia".

The resolution provides for the establishment of a commission to consider a political responsibility of members of the Presidium and Secretariat of the KSS Central Committee for the crisis which started to develop inside the party after November 17. The congress decided to suspend the party membership of some former leading functionaries of these bodies, including I. Janak, G. Slapka, E. Litvajova, V. Salgovic, I. Gonko, S. Bachar and E. Turzo.

Special resolution to rehabilitate several former party members was also passed.

The congress elected a new KSS Central Committee (93 members) and a 23-member Central Control and Auditing Commission.

The Central Committee of the Comunist Party of Slovakia elected an 11-member Executive Committee at its first meeting. Jan Siroky, head of the department of the KSC Central Committee, was elected the executive committee's chairman. Other Executive Committee members include Petr Vjs, Pavel Kanis, Dusan Podhorsky, Josef Polak, Vladimir Jakubac, Ladislav Krajnak, Milan Ftacnik, Vladimir Raucina, Bozena Rutkajova and Jan Kasper.

Jan Demikat became chairman of the Central Control and Auditing Commission.

The congress denied by the majority of votes the proposal of the editorial boards of the newspapers PRAVDA and UJ SZO to remove the slogan "Workers of the World, Unite" from the front pages of these newspapers.

MSZMP Congress Opens 17 Dec in Budapest

LD1712172589 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Budapest December 17 TASS—The 14th Congress of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party (HSWP) [MSZMP] opened here today. 500 delegates and 200 guests are attending the congress. Representatives of the primary organisations of the renewed party have gathered to try and overcome rifts, elect the leading bodies of the party, approve the new rules and adopt a declaration.

The congress was declared open by the oldest member of the Hungarian working class movement, one of the founders of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, Gyorgy Marosan.

The delegates observed a minute of silence to commemorate outstanding leader of the Hungarian and world workers' movement Janos Kadar.

The political report, made on behalf of the congress' preparatory committee [by] Karoly Grosz, said the HSWP was a living and active party. The Hungarian people need a Marxist party whose principal task is to serve the cause of the working masses. This party based on scientific Marxism is called upon to respond to the issues of the present and the future.

At present the number of those who confirmed their adherence to the HSWP by their signatures has exceeded 65,000. In addition there are thousands of communists who vowed their allegiance to the party in collective lists.

The report analyses questions of renewal, the style of the party work and effective restructuring of its leading bodies. Grosz favoured nominating young, energetic and knowledgeable communists for leading posts.

"We must turn our party," he said, "into a single Marxist party. To impart an impulse to this process and promote it is our historic duty."

In the afternoon the congress discussed the new rules. The delegates considered the elections of the new HSWP leadership behind closed doors.

Walesa Urges Special Government Economic Powers

90UI0210A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 13 Dec 89 p 3

[TASS report: "L. Walesa Proposal"]

[Text] Warsaw (TASS)—Taking into account the serious socioeconomic situation in the country and the growing impatience of the population, Lech Walesa, chairman of the "Solidarity" trade union, came out with a proposal in a statement published today to grant the government special powers in the area of legal regulation of the most important spheres of economic life.

The situation in the country is getting worse, and time is flying, the statement says. The public credit of trust has almost exhausted itself. The changes being implemented by the government have a positive character, but they are assessed as being too slow. The discussions in the Sejm have a cautious character, but this, however, delays the legislative process and postpones the possibility of the economy functioning through dependence on economic laws alone. It is for this reason that it is necessary to operate quickly and decisively.

Proceeding from this, the leader of "Solidarity" proposed endowing the government with special powers in the area of the legal regulation of such questions as:

perestroyka of the structure of the economy, changes in the nature of property, demonopolization of the state and cooperative sector, the tax system, the system of bookkeeping, the functioning of banks, and changes in the state structure, including organs of self-government. For the purpose of increasing efficiency, the legal acts, published by the government on the basis of special powers, would go into effect from the time they are published.

In addition, there is a stipulation in the proposal that the Sejm should endow the government with these powers for a strictly defined period and in relation to a clearly outlined sphere of problems. In this period, the Sejm and the Senate could quietly work on other important legal acts, with retention of the right of possible corrections to governmental decisions.

L. Walesa emphasizes that he fully realizes the contradiction in this proposal. The situation in the country makes it necessary to propose it.

'Anti-Soviet' Demonstrations Held in Poland

PM1512164089 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Poland: Anti-Soviet Demonstrations"]

[Text] In a number of Polish cities the midday silence was broken on Wednesday by factory whistles, car and bus horns, and the ringing of bells in some of the churches. This was the response to the appeal by the ad hoc all-Polish commission of the trade union "Solidarity" on the eighth anniversary of the imposition of martial law in Poland on 13 December 1981.

Presenting the official viewpoint at a press conference in Warsaw, Polish Government press spokesman M. Niezabytowska said: It is profoundly symbolic that in the Council of Ministers now there are both those who were interned and those who interned them. The gulf that separated them then seemed insuperable, but now they have formed a broad coalition government that enjoys the support of the vast majority of Poles. And that is the best evidence that these 8 years cannot be described as wasted, that they acted as a lesson to both sides.

However, a number of extremist, primarily youth organizations used the 13 December anniversary to organize demonstrations and rallies of an antisocialist and anti-Soviet nature. In Krakow, at the call of the "Freedom and Peace" grouping, some 150 extremists held a rally in the city's central square. The crowd then approached the building of the USSR's Consulate General in Krakow, where hooligans painted anti-Soviet slogans on the fence. Rampaging thugs broke into the Krakow Voivodship Polish United Workers Party [PZPR] building, held a pogrom, broke windows, and set fire to a newspaper kiosk.

In Warsaw, provocative demonstrations were organized outside the PZPR Central Committee building, and also at the monument "To those who fell in the struggle for the formation of the people's power in Poland," at which hooligans threw stones and bottles. Large-scale clashes between demonstrators under the banners of the "Confederation for an Independent Poland" and "Fighting Solidarity" and the militia took place in Wroclaw, where extremists attacked the local internal affairs administration. Water cannon were used to impose order.

The proposal put forward by L. Walesa, chairman of the "Solidarity" trade union, on endowing the Polish Government with special powers in the sphere of legal regulation of the most important spheres of economic life prompted a mixed reaction in Poland.

In the opinion of the All-Polish Trade Unions Alliance Executive Committee Secretariat, the "Solidarity" leader has proposed the imposition of a kind of "martial law" in the economy. His proposals, the statement says, mean in practice restricting civil rights and excluding all the trade unions from public life.

Of course, the situation of T. Mazowiecki's government is very difficult, L. Miller, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, noted in an interveiw for the newspaper TRYBUNA LUDU. The necessary economic reforms require socially tough measures and some sacrifices by the entire population, the tightening of belts. But the PZPR has always warned that the burden associated with the implementation of reforms should be fairly shared by all, and it is the state's duty to ensure the social protection of the poorest strata.

Problems in SFRY Society, Army Viewed

PM1512125189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 First Edition p 3

[Colonel V. Markushin report: "Familiar and Unfamiliar Yugoslavia. View of a Country Experiencing a Difficult Period of Renewal"]

[Excerpt] Belgrade-Moscow—[passage omitted] Your first outward impression of Yugoslav reality is one of the calm tenor of life and of stores crammed with goods, where disciplined Yugoslavs spend their millions. However, on closer examination the picture is supplemented by different, more essential color and detail. The abundance of commodities is neutralized by hyperinflation, while the population's discipline by no means extends in all areas to the economic sphere with its low labor productivity. What is perhaps Yugoslavia's main problem today emerges here. I heard the crux of this problem enunciated in the following intelligible way: We are working as if under a bad socialist system but trying to live as though under communism.

What are the reasons for this? The press' view is that the country has exhausted the possibilities of the model based on a combination of market relations and planning principles. The difficulties stem from the fact that the economic mechanism is in disorder, coordination of the activity of numerous activities is poor, interrepublic economic ties are gone, and the republics' disunity in general state decisionmaking is taking its toll.

Relations between Serbia and Slovenia have become particularly acute. It is, in effect, a question of a conflict which, according to TANJUG, threatens the country with tragic consequences. The situation in Kosovo has grown complex once again. Demonstrations by Albanian separatists here, entailing loss of life, constitute, according to the LCY Central Committee Presidium, a form of political pressure on state organs and on everyone who is striving to stabilize the situation in this autonomous republic. It is typical that most Albanian nationals do not support the extremists.

The situation in the country is aggravated by the failure to resolve a number of social problems such as, for instance, the problem of 1.5 million unemployed and the housing problem. Take the latter. Approximately 1 million Yugoslavs have no housing at all and are forced to rent. At the same time, rents are high. In Belgrade a modest room costs a sum equivalent to $200 or more.

There is no community of views on the nature of the concrete measures that must be adopted as a matter of urgency to extricate the country from the crisis situation. For instance, how is inflation to be overcome? The supporters of radical measures propose freezing prices, wages, and the dinar exchange rate against leading currencies and stopping the practice of high interest rates for the country's citizens. Their opponents cleave to a different viewpoint: They say that life in Yugoslavia will come to a total standstill without inflation, there will be nothing to settle the debts, and the commodity situation will be like that in the Soviet Union.

Extensive debates are also under way on more fundamental philosophical questions. They received a fresh boost in connection with events in the countries of East Europe, which are described here as "political earthquakes." Above all this relates to the question of the prospects of socialist development in Yugoslavia and the new-look socialism. Naturally, forms of ownership are the center of these debates. Some people (Slovenian representatives, for instance) advocate equality of all forms of ownership. Others insist on social ownership holding a dominant special position. There is no consensus on these questions, not only among various social and scientific circles but also within the LCY, which found itself divided on the principle of its members' affiliation to particular republics.

The attitude to the role of the Armed Forces: Opinions are also disparate here. At the recent Yugoslav People's Army Conference no attempt was made to hide concern that appropriations for defense needs are being cut, and there has been a marked reduction in the use of production capacities employed in the defense sector. According to the country's military-political leadership, if the situation develops further on these lines this will call into question the concept of reliance on their own resources in arms production. People in the country regard the army as an important social factor, a moral-political monolith which cements unity between Yugoslavs and may prevent the elimination of socialism in Yugoslavia. At the same time, voices can also be heard calling for "depoliticization" of the armed forces. "Socialism that has to be defended by tanks is bad socialism," M. Kucan, leader of the League of Communists of Slovenia, believes. You may ask, does "good capitalism" have no defense?

How far does the acute nature of interethnic relations affect the situation in the army? How, for instance, do Serbian and Albanian servicemen coexist? We spoke with Colonel S. Stanojevic, Lieutenant Colonel B. Miletic, and other Yugoslav friends on this subject. They said that there has not as yet been any question of barracks-room ethnic clashes. On the contrary, there are many examples that attest to mutual sympathies between soldiers of various nationalities.

The Federal Secretariat for National Defense Political Directorate, which we visited, expressed a high opinion of personnel's moral-political state. "It is important to analyze new processes in order to amend the substance of political work with servicemen and facilitate through this work the preservation of fundamental social values," Colonel D. Zunic, deputy chief of the Political Directorate, said during a conversation with us.

Preservation of fundamental values: Indeed, this is a noble and difficult task in conditions where public opinion is literally oppressed by most evil opinions and conclusions, conditions where people loudly say that socialism "has not passed the historical test" and that the country's future must be linked with a different sociopolitical system.

Yugoslavia is experiencing a difficult period. Obviously there is nothing more valuable today for the good of its people than well-considered decisions, political wisdom, and staunchness in the face of the difficulties of renewal.

LCY President Thanks CPSU for Congratulations

PM1512141989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 12

[LCY's Pancevski thanks CPSU Central Committee for congratulations]

[Text] To the CPSU Central Committee

Dear Comrades,

We cordially thank you for the warm congratulations and best wishes to us on Republic Day.

We are confident that the relations and cooperation between the League of Communists of Yugoslavia [LCY] and the CPSU will continue to develop successfully for the good of the equitable and all-around cooperation between our countries, the friendship between our peoples, peace and social progress.

[Signed] Milan Pancevski, president of the LCY Central Committee Presidium

Economic Reasons Behind E. European Reforms

OW1812062789 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 15 Dec 89

[(Malishev) commentary]

[Text] Profound changes have recently taken place in the societies of Bulgaria, GDR, Czechoslovakia, and other countries. Following is an article by our station commentator (Malishev) in this connection:

Although these countries are faced with different crises, the basic reason for such crises remains the same. That is, society in these countries can no longer survive under such conditions. The economic situation, social relations, and the political situation are beyond the comprehension of the people on the road to socialism. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said at a CPSU Standing Committee session: What has happened in some socialist countries is the result of economic changes in these countries and has made their people realize the need to bring about change.

It can be said that socialist countries are accumulating new experiences. Reforms carried out by China, Hungary, Poland, the Soviet Union, and other nations show that only when producers are able to facilitate the flow of commodities and the circulation of money can we develop the socialist economy. This should regulate itself and make continual changes to keep pace with the changing situation. Many socialist countries are developing in this direction. Some have built flexible markets for their foreign exchange. There are capital markets in China, Poland, and Hungary, where stocks, bonds, and other negotiable securities are allowed to change hands. Some of the countries are discussing building [words indistinct]. New progress in these socialist nations will inevitably affect their relations and change their mechanism of cooperation. While advocating a fixed economic policy, some countries are changing their relations with their trade partners and making plans for promoting economic development in a more coordinated manner.

Currently, the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance [CEMA] is vigorously discussing with economic departments in various countries new ways to further strengthen cooperation and build an integrated socialist market. Hungary and Poland, CEMA members in the forefront of economic reform, have not only advocated close cooperation between CEMA nations, but also further promoted [words indistinct].

Economic changes have made the economies in socialist nations even more flexible and wider open to the world. All this has helped promote the trend of integration among socialist countries. Formalist and bureaucratic practices in applying administrative pressure and ignoring the real market value of commodities have begun to disappear, while the phenomena of closer economic ties among producers and free conversion of currencies have begun to emerge. All this will help promote economic integration among socialist nations even more effectively.

West Europe

Shevardnadze Visit to Brussels, EC Talks Viewed

Accord Product of Rapprochement

LD1512220989 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS correspondent Georg Mikhaylin:

The forthcoming trade, commercial and economic agreement between the Soviet Union and the European Communities is a product of the Soviet-E.C. rapprochement that began after the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two in August 1989.

On the other hand, it must impart new quality to the links between the Soviet Union and the European Communities, Vladimir Zyuev, head of the Common Market Research Group at the Soviet Institute of the World Economy and International Relations, told TASS.

The agreement, to be signed in Brussels by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on December 18, is expected to regulate a wide range of questions concerning trade, economic, scientific and technical cooperation for the next ten years or more if the sides agree to prolong it.

The Soviet Union and the European Communities will grant each other most-favoured nation treatment. It is also expected that by the end of 1995, the Common Market will lift quantity restrictions on imports from the Soviet Union of all the three groups of commodities (sensitive, less sensitive and non-sensitive).

However a reservation that a country may temporarily impose quantitative restrictions on imports of commodities overproduced domestically, will be included in the text of the agreement.

Trade in textiles may become the subject of a separate agreement. Representatives of the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations and the Commission of European Communities have already agreed to expand the quota for textile imports, the Soviet expert said.

Economic, scientific and technological cooperation will cover power engineering, including nuclear, the establishment of joint enterprises, banking and insurance, marketing, transport, tourism, new technologies of farm produce processing, foodstuffs production, the protection of intellectual property, manager training and an extensive exchange of commercial information.

Work on the draft agreement was far from simple. Some Soviet departments were parochial in their approach and insisted on confining cooperation to trade alone. The leading bodies of the European Communities were also apprehensive.

Eventually broad agreement of the development of relations between the Soviet Union and the Common Market developed, encouraged by the general warming of East-West relations, Zuyev said.

Shevardnadze Interviewed on EC

LD1512222189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1752 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 15 Dec (TASS)—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze gave an interview to a TASS diplomatic correspondent. The text of the interview follows:

Question: Eduard Amvrosiyevich! Your visit to Brussels has been announced. To all appearances, it will be multifaceted. Which aspects of the visit would you single out first of all?

Answer: I do not know if it is possible, in the given instance, to construct some kind of scale of priorities. There will be many very important meetings over a day and a half.

First of all, I want to speak about the part of the visit to Brussels which will take place within the framework of the working visit to Belgium. At the current, very dynamic stage of international relations, we have the opportunity to intensify our dialogue with Belgium which has always participated actively in the formation of the conceptions of European politics. Belgium is one of those countries which, in the most direct way, has felt the warm wind of changes in international affairs and whose security has been tangibly strengthened as a result of the first steps in cutting nuclear arsenals. For this reason, I am convinced that Belgium will contribute a worthy input to establishing of a peaceful period and to the construction of a common European home, comfortable for all.

There also exists another aspect in our relations with Belgium: the economic aspect. And here many possibilities for cooperaiton are opening up. It is indicative that Belgium, along with Luxembourg, was the first EEC member with which our country signed an agreement on mutual protection and promotion of capital investments. In general, I am counting on our traditionally stable and firm relations with Belgium undergoing further development.

Question: You mentioned economic cooperation. It is obvious that the agreement on trade and commercial and economic cooperation between the USSR and the EEC and Euratom [European Atomic Energy Community], which is to be signed in Brussels, is called on to play a noticeable role in its development on the European continent...

Answer: I agree with such a description. I think that this agreement will be genuinely mutually advantageous. It is in the interests of the European Community countries to avoid shutting themselves into the 'single internal market' of the EC after its creation in 1992. It is in the interests of our country to move toward integration into the system of world economic links. In this sense the very agreement with the EC is an important stage of our economic restructuring, just as it is evidence of a certain international recognition of the viability of the new economic mechanism which is being formed in the USSR during the course of perestroyka. On a practical level, this agreement will regulate the economic relations between the USSR and the 12 member countries of the Community on a wide range of trade, production, investment, and scientific and technical cooperation.

Question: Among your numerous conversations in New York this September, during the UN General Assembly session, your meeting with the foreign ministers of the EC countries stood out as being unusual. Will there be another such meeting in Brussels?

Answer: There are plans for a meeting in Brussels with the foreign ministers of the EC countries. I mention this with satisfaction, because the first such contact in New York has remained in my mind as a substantive and highly useful one. We spoke then about major problems in world politics and about arms cuts, and touched on certain regional conflict situations. A general wish was expressed that such meetings should be held regularly. A broad, and I have no doubt, constructive political dialogue will now be continued in Brussels.

Question: Brussels is, however, also NATO's headquarters. Does this not cast something of a shadow over your visit?

Answer: When we began talking about the need to get rid of the "enemy image", we had in mind not only the senseless notion of a "Soviet threat", but also a willingness on our side to look at things without prejudice.

The reality is such that NATO and the Warsaw Pact are elements of the present European situation. The political rather than the military element is becoming ever more important in the activities of the Warsaw Pact. NATO is also talking about strengthening the alliance's political functions. Why not exploit these trends to turn what used to be structures of confrontation into structures of dialogue?

These are the conceptual standpoints from which I am approaching my forthcoming meeting in Brussels with NATO's Secretary General M. Woerner. I think there is something symbolic in the fact that this meeting, the first of its kind, will take place in the very headquarters of the North Atlantic Alliance. And this will be no "fortress-taking", but yet another confirmation that the "cold war" has ended. Both diplomats and military men in the West and in the East are now ever more actively uniting their efforts to create an atmosphere free of hostility and fear. Only by activating all possible channels and forms of dialogue will we succeed in creating a united Europe, a genuine common European home.

Question: It has become known that after Brussels you will visit London as well. What is the reason for such, as far as one is able to judge, an unexpected widening of your plans?

Answer: Political and diplomatic contacts have now become much more efficient than only a few years ago. Such is the demand of the times, and the new level of mutual understanding is creating the necessary conditions for this.

Out dialogue with Great Britain—an important place which the meetings of M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher occupy—has a very dynamic and close nature. The reasons for this do not require particular explanations; the role of England [as received] in Europe and the world is generally known. I will only note that the Soviet Union and Great Britain, together with the United States and France, also carry particular responsibility for peace and stability in Europe by virtue of the quadripartite decisions during and after the war. I expect an intensive and constructive conversation with M. Thatcher, and also expect to establish a good, businesslike contact with my colleague D. Hurd, the foreign secretary. I am talking about this with confidence, because the sphere of common approaches by our two countries to world affairs in recent years has widened noticeably.

Arrives in Brussels

LD1712193189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1843 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels, 17 Dec (TASS)—E. A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of foreign affairs, today arrived in Belgium on a visit.

At the Zeventem International Airport, Shevardnadze was met by M. Eyskens, Belgian minister of foreign affairs, and by other officials. Among those meeting him was the USSR ambassador to Belgium F. P. Bogdanov and the head of the USSR mission attached to the EC, V. G. Shemyatenkov.

Meets Belgian Officials

LD1812110889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1040 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Brussels, 18 December, (TASS)—E.A. Shevardnadze, Communist Party of the Soviet Union Central Committee Politburo member and USSR foreign minister, who has arrived in Belgium on a visit, was received today by Belgian King Baudouin. A talk also took place with Belgian Prime Minister Wilfried Martens.

Also today, Soviet-Belgian negotiations began in the "Egmont" Palace. The Belgian delegation is led by Mark Eyskens, minister of exernal relations. Relations between the two countries will be discussed at the negotiations, as well as issues of economic cooperation. The sides are exchanging opinions on ways for further developing the pan-European process, and strengthening mutual understanding and interaction on the European continent.

TASS Comment on Keys to German Border Issue

LD1512203889 Moscow TASS in English 1823 GMT 15 Dec 89

["Europarliament on Chancellor Kohl's Plans—TASS Comment"]

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Albert Balebanov:

The deputies of the European Parliament have urged the Government of The Federal Republic of Germany to clearly reaffirm existing European borders as they were recognised in the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).

This call is contained in a number of resolutions adopted by members of the European Parliament in Strasbourg on Thursday.

It is not by chance that these resolutions emerged. Serious misgivings arose in Western Europe in the light of Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl's remarks about the issue of reunification of the two German states.

The chancellor, it seems, avoids definite commitments on existing European borders.

As a consequence, the vagueness of his phraseology aroused serious suspicions among the European public that Bonn does not intend to respect the post-war European set-up, specifically, the present Western borders of Poland.

The doubts were not dispelled by statements made by vice-chancellor and Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher who specially emphasised that the Federal Republic does not intend to follow a "special road" and that the Federal Government firmly abides by the treaties with socialist countries and will act in accordance with present realities.

There are doubts both in socialist countries and in the West about the sincerity of the West German cabinet's position. The different wording in pronouncements by Kohl and Genscher gave rise to heated debates in Western political circles, particularly in Europe.

Demands are voiced from all sides that the Federal Government should take up an unambiguous stand over the issue of observance of the post-war status quo in Europe.

These demands are apparently prompted by a desire to strengthen the stability and security of our continent.

It must be recalled that many Western leaders, including U.S. President George Bush, President Francois Mitterrand of France and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, have pointed out that processes connected with the future of the two German states should evolve with strict observance of all the principles of the Final Act of the CSCE conference that seals the inviolability of borders.

Western European Union Secretary-General Willem van Eekelen has admitted that if reunification of the two German states would lead to a situation like that on the eve of the second World War, then, from the viewpoint of the Dutch people, they would not like to relive those times.

A public opinion poll taken in Denmark has shown that the population of that country fear reunification of two German states if it is not carried out with due regard for present realities in Europe.

This concern is also shared by many in the Federal Republic itself. The Presidium of the Social Democratic Party of Germany (SPD) has unanimously adopted a document entitled "The Germans in Europe".

It emphasises that "the interests of the Europeans, including Germans, call for the unreserved recognition of the present western Polish borders. Those who advocate the restoration of the German reich within the borders of 1937 and favour a special German road are blocking the European integration process."

Putting it in a nutshell, the principle of the inviolability of borders and territorial integrity is the key one in any solution of the "German issue".

It is evident that, if this principle is eroded, the Helsinki conference's Final Act will prove untenable as a whole and the CSCE process which is developing to the satisfaction of all peoples would be imperiled.

Possibilities for German Reunification Considered

LD1712224589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Video report by Vladimir Kondratyev in the FRG; from the "International Panorama" program]

[Excerpts] At the very beginning of the process of reform in the GDR—and according to a widely-held view here, it is significantly overtaking Soviet perestroyka—the problem of German reunification hardly arose. Everything was too fragile and uncertain and one could clearly feel the desire of West German politicians not to test unnecessarily the strength of the interGerman dialogue that was being born.

Now, when every day brings new evidence of the irreversibility of the fundamental changes in the GDR, the supporters of reunification are founding a general assembly. They are not stopped by any ideas of a social, political, or economic nature, nor by the position of the victorious powers who are concerned about the overhasty rapprochement of the Germans. [passage omitted] It is difficult now to predict how things will develop. One cannot help noticing that voices favoring reunification are being heard more and more in the GDR itself, among ordinary people, something that didn't happen immediately after the opening of the borders. According to a poll, at the end of November, 40 percent of GDR citizens were not opposed to reunification. In the FRG the similar figure is 78 percent.

This gives the chancellor grounds to resort to his plan for achieving German unity: his idea is that the Germans must be given the chance to express their opinion on this problem by means of a referendum. If GDR citizens oppose it, the FRG will respect their decision. The chancellor believes that time will work in favor of his idea, for more and more people from the GDR are traveling to the West and are seeing how much wealthier life is there, and feel themselves poor relations because of their lack of foreign currency.

Every evening on FRG television they can see what the Communist Party has brought their country to: cheerless, neglected buildings, prewar equipment in the works and factories, a catastrophic situation in the field of environmental protection, constant revelations of criminal activities by functionaries. However much they try here to prove that it would be an insult to the Germans of the GDR to suppose that they favor reunification for economic reasons—they claim that the ethnic factor is important, as it were, blood ties crying out—the hope for a change for the better in daily life as a result of reunification plays a most important role.

Here no one gives the ruling party of the GDR any chances. Even the Social Democrats have announced that they are breaking off all their contacts with it. From now on they will support the new Social Democratic Party of the GDR. It is presumed in the FRG that the tasks of the party headed by Gysi and Modrow are very difficult. If they do not manage to achieve important results in a short time, the party might fall apart completely and then those people on whom the FRG is banking could come to power.

With all of this one must not rule out the reckoning Western countries. The French and the British are the most restrained about the question of a speedy reunification. The Americans do not want to lose their influence in West Germany: they say they are in favor of reunification but without fixing a specific time, so as not to needlessly humiliate the Soviet Union, says the U.S. ambassador in Bonn, for example.

But what has humiliation to do with it? For the euphoria of reunification will not be a substitute for answers to questions which are arising anyway, and not only in the Soviet Union. A united Germany as envisaged in Christian Democrat circles will be a legally completely new formation, to which existing treaties would not extend.

And what about the borders of 1937? Polish Silesia, Czechoslovak Sudetenland, Soviet Kaliningrad—formerly Koenigsberg: it is not for nothing that the chancellor rightly or wrongly wants to avoid discussing this problem, for the FRG constitutional court does not recognize the Oder-Neisse line—the border between the GDR and Poland. Won't there be a threat in the future to the status quo which was established with such difficulty? It is unlikely that anyone would start a nuclear war in Europe because of this, but there are economic and political methods of putting pressure on neighbors who do not agree.

And where will Germany go after reunification? The neutrality of Germany would cost too much: this is the opinion of the Americans, and Christian Democratic Union politicians applaud this, asserting that the Germans will not give up their legitimate place in NATO for anything. Not only this: even after West and East Europe have been grafted together it will be confronted by the huge and unpredictable Soviet Union. So there you have a European-American home instead of a common European one.

The problem of German reunification cannot be considered in isolation from the general integration processes taking place on our continent. Here one can agree with those politicians in the FRG who put the question just like this. It would be senseless in these times to come out as a matter of principle against reunification as such, all the more so if both the West and East Germans want it. But all the necessary conditions must be created. In fact no one in the FRG knows when this will be possible, not even the most impatient people who are refusing to admit that haste of any sort is capable of making reunification into an unripe fruit of postwar history which could be poisonous.

Mitterrand Takes Up 'Helsinki II' Proposal

90UI0201A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 7

[Report of Dmitriy Yakushkin, correspondent of NOVOSTI and SOVETSKAYA KULTURA: "The Times and Responsibility"]

[Text] Paris—The new expression "accelerating history" has already taken a firm hold. Official meetings of the main political leaders which were at one time of a diplomatic-protocol nature are now producing entirely specific results.

If we view from this angle the Kiev meeting between M. Gorbachev and F. Mitterrand, which was not planned in advance, France's consent to the holding in 1990 of "Helsinki II"—a second summit of 33 European states and also America and Canada—may be cited as one of the results. Just a week has elapsed since this proposal was made by the Soviet leader, and now a new element in the European political crossword has appeared—Mitterrand's approbatory response.

The French president has been extremely active in recent months. As the temporary head of the European Community, he has in this time toured all the EEC states for talks on integration. At the end of October Mitterrand expounded to the members of the Europarliament in Strasbourg on his idea of the creation of a bank for the development and modernization of East Europe and also a European fund for the training of personnel for these same countries. Then came the "special dinner" at his residence—the Elysee Palace—at which the leaders of the "twelve" accepted the president's proposals. It was the first time they had gathered as such to agree on a purely political decision. Several hours of negotiations were no impediment to the French president that evening: Despite the late hour—his news conference went on until after midnight—he met with journalists and unhurriedly answered their questions. He was clearly satisfied.

Of course, disagreements within the "twelve" are not paraded, but the position of each country has its nuances, particularly of such influential ones as Great Britain and the FRG. It is known, for example, that Thatcher is more than cool toward certain integration projects, specifically, the so-called "Social Charter," which is designed to standardize social rights in the countries of a future "united" Europe. As far as Bonn's policy is concerned, Paris is watching closely to see how further participation in European building and the new relations with the GDR will be combined there.

The "German question" is the second topic which Paris newspapers are highlighting in commentaries on the Kiev meeting, calling attention to the fact that Mitterrand was entirely unequivocal in his opposition to a change in the borders.

This was the fifth meeting between Mitterrand and Gorbachev. But even compared with the summer, when the Soviet leader paid an official visit to Paris, the climate has changed. The "eastern" theme is on the front pages of France's dailies, as a rule. Analytical dossiers and special supplements on these issues are being prepared by the weeklies. The picture is the same on radio and television. A few days ago, for example, the second television program, Antenne II, was airing France's most popular political program, "Hour of Truth," in which I was also participating. A prominent politician from East Europe—Hungarian Minister of State Imre Pozsgay—was invited on as a guest for the first time. The program was relayed to all of Europe, as well as being received in Budapest, for the first time. A Soviet journalist was invited on for the first time. Despite the specific nature of the discussion, which concerned problems of Hungarian society, in competition with a film starring Romy Schneider showing on a parallel channel, the program was seen by a large audience.

It sometimes seems that domestic policy topics have currently receded into the background altogether in France. French members of parliament, ministers, and secretaries of political parties simply cannot in their public pronouncements remain silent about the changes in the socialist countries. Michel Rocard, one of the brightest politicians of the past decade and now premier, has said in this connection: "The end of the Berlin Wall is the end of a nightmare; it is the end of frontal confrontation not only between the two military superpowers, but also the two models of social system. It seems to me that the main danger—that of thermonuclear war—is henceforward condemned to disappear."

And one final observation apropos the Kiev meeting. Before flying to the Ukrainian capital together with the president, Hubert Vedrin, official spokesman of the Elysee Palace, told me that relations between Mitterrand and Gorbachev were built on personal trust. The warm nature of precisely the personal relations between the two politicians was a third aspect of the Kiev meeting commented upon in detail by the press. Of course, personal trust depends on a combination of characters. But it is obvious that common goals in policy contribute to its emergence.

Turkish Paper Interviews General Varennikov

NC1312204389 Istanbul MILLIYET in Turkish 6 Dec 89 p 15

[Report by Sema Emiroglu: "A 5-Point Message From the Soviet Union"]

[Excerpts] Ankara—In a way befitting Gorbachev's perestroyka policy, the Commander in Chief of the Soviet Armed Forces and First Deputy Minister of Defense, Valentin I. Varennikov, who is also the brains of the Soviet Red Army, conveyed a message of peace, friendship, and admiration to Ankara while replying to questions from a MILLIYET correspodent.

We met General Varennikov, who is 66 years old, during the 60 minutes he had to spare following his intensive talks in Ankara. The meeting took place on the eighth floor of Gazi Orduevi, which is an officers' recreation complex.

General Varennikov began to express his views by recalling Lenin and Ataturk's wish for the Turkish and Soviet peoples to live in friendship and as good neighbors. Noting that the two countries have fulfilled this wish, Varennikov said that although different events have existed in the history of the two countries since 1920, their relations in general can be described as "positive."

General Varennikov said that he conveyed a message from USSR Minister of Defense Dimitriy Yazov to Minister of National Defense Safa Giray, thanking the latter for the following:

1. The quick return of Private Rodinov, who crossed into Turkey dressed in a general's uniform;
2. The return of a Soviet MiG-29 to the Soviet Union within a very short period of time;
3. The undisturbed and unobstructed crossing of Soviet ships through the Dardanelles;
4. The significant aid extended by the Turkish people and military forces to the victims of the terrible earthquake in the Caucasus;
5. The maintenance of order on the Soviet-Turkish border and the absence of any problem in relations between Soviet military forces in regions beyond the Caucasus and the Turkish Armed Forces. [passage omitted]

Varennikov said that in his talks in Ankara he explained the progress of the perestroyka era and the kind of decisions that are being made in accordance with the perestroyka process. Noting that he also explained the bearing the perestroyka process is having on bilateral relations, Varennikov asserted:

"Our Armed Forces will be reduced by 500,000 men and 10,000 tanks, 8,500 artillery pieces will be destroyed, and 820 military aircraft will be decommissioned. I have explained all this. Measures are being taken on the question of reducing the Armed Forces. We want our neighbor to know that we are reducing the military units we have outside the Soviet Union. We are withdrawing six divisions from the West and disbanding three divisions. Three divisions will be used in providing depot bases. All of them are armored units."

Varennikov said that the withdrawal of divisions from the Caucasus border region as a gesture is out of the question for the time being. However, he added that the matter will be discussed between the two sides in order to determine the actual strength of the military units in the region. [passage omitted]

Cooperation With UK on Antidrug Operation

LD1612103689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Soviet and British customs officials have carried out their first joint operation against drug smuggling. It all started with a find by Soviet customs officials in two containers passing through the USSR in transit to Great Britain. Carefully concealed packages of drugs were found in them. After consultations with their British colleagues, the customs officials returned the packages to their former places and accompanied the containers across the territory of the USSR to Leningrad where they were loaded onto a British ship. The cargo was then carried by British operatives. In Britain, the containers were kept under secret observation for 3 weeks. As a result, individual members of the gang were first arrested, and then the leader.

There was much in this case that was done for the first time: The appearance of representatives of Soviet customs authorities in a British court as prosecution witnesses, the exchange of valuable operational information, and finally, the practical cooperation between the two countries in the fight against the drug trade.

Latin America & Caribbean

TASS Reports U.S. Troops on Alert in Panama

LD1812073489 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] New York December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Andrey Sitov:

The United States has alerted its troops in Panama. According to a spokesman for the U.S. Southern Command, American servicemen have been ordered not to leave their bases and not to appear in public places.

The step has been taken following a Saturday incident in the capital of Panama, the American ABC television company reported. It described the incident as the gravest clash between American and Panamanian servicemen in the part 25 years.

According to Panamanian representatives, a number of American servicemen in a car broke through the post at one of the streets leading to the headquarters of Panama's National Defence Forces and opened fire. The unit on guard of the building returned the fire and then the car with the attackers disappeared.

The American authorities deny such an interpretation of events. They say that four officers in a car were on a leave of absence, they did not have weapons and did not initiate the exchange of fire. Right after the incident the U.S. Southern Command announced that one of the officers was gravely wounded and died in an American military hospital.

On Sunday evening, the Pentagon made a new statement saying that one more officer who was in the car was wounded. Besides, according to the U.S. Defence Department, in Panama there was another incident involving an American serviceman. A U.S. naval officer was detained and beaten. His wife was with him. Later they were released.

The Pentagon's statement did not say whether the U.S. administration was going to take any retaliatory steps vis-a-vis Panama in connection with the incidents, and if it is going to what exactly steps will be taken.

According to the ABC report, conferences under the chairmanship of Defence Secretary Richard Cheney continued at the U.S. Defence Department all over Sunday. One of the American officials told the television company that the aim of the conferences was to ascertain facts and elaborate alternative versions of decisions for U.S. President George Bush.

U.S. Servicemen Cause 'Dangerous Incident'

LD1812091889 Moscow TASS in English 0606 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Panama December 18 TASS—By TASS correspondent Eldar Abdullayev:

A group of American servicemen provoked a dangerous incident in the capital of Panama. Local television cited a spokesman of the Panamanian National Defence Forces as describing the episode in which four U.S. officers drove [words indistinct] car at top speed by the control posts of the joint headquarters of the Panamanian National Defence Forces and opened fire at the building.

Guard company units started a pursuit and stopped the car in the suburban district of Chorillo. According to Panamanian servicemen, the American officers who were evidently drunk refused to leave the car and present their identification papers. In a shoot-out that followed, one American was gravely wounded and died en route to hospital.

In a television address on the channel of the South American Command, Colonel Ronald Sconiers admitted that four American servicemen, unidentified as yet, appeared in an unauthorized place at unauthorized time after dinner in a restaurant. In the district of Chorillo, he said, Panamanians tried to force the Americans out of their car and when shown resistance, opened fire. He said the Panamanians had no ground for the action.

Sconiers said the action of the American servicemen had no political motives behind it. He noted that the incident in question is regarded as grave and can have negative consequences for Panamanian-U.S. relations that are already very complicated.

Panama Says U.S. Sanctions 'State Terrorism'

LD1812110589 Moscow TASS in English 1055 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Panama December 18 TASS—The Panamanian Government has condemned new U.S. sanctions against Panama. A government statement released here described the U.S. decision to ban ships flying the Panamanian flag from calling at U.S. ports as an act of state terrorism against the sovereignty and independence of Panama and a gross violation of international law.

The U.S. decision infringes on the basic principles of the United Nations Charter and that of the Organisation of the American States which forbid trade and economic aggression to achieve political goals, the statement said.

The Panamanian Government demanded that the United States immediately cancel its irresponsible and provocative measure which not only damages the interests of states using the Panama Canal, but also undermines a key sector of the Panamanian economy.

"For how long Panama will continue to be an object of endless sanctions?," the statement asked.

Congress of People's Deputies

FRG Radio, TV Equipment To Broadcast Congress

LD1012150589 Moscow TASS in English 1038 GMT 10 Dec 89

[Text] Bonn December 10 TASS—By TASS correspondent Mikhail Stepovik:

A consignment of radio and television equipment is being prepared to be sent to Moscow by the West German firm BTS.

The equipment to be installed in the Kremlin will be used for direct transmission of the Soviet parliament's sessions and sessions of Congresses of Soviet People's Deputies.

A representative of the firm, located in Darmstadt, told the DPA News Agency that its personnel took pride in the order and would do their best for the equipment to be properly installed and to start functioning in the new year's opening days.

The new equipment will enable foreign viewers and listeners to keep an eye over the course of work of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Thereby, we shall make our contribution to broadening public openness, he added.

In accordance with the contract, television cameras, monitors and control desks will be supplied by the BTS firm, a joint venture of the Phillips and Bosch concerns. The delivery of the equipment to the consignees will begin in the next few days.

Moscow TV Relays 14 Dec Congress Meetings

1304 GMT 15 Dec

LD1512204389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1304 GMT on 15 December begins to broadcast a recorded video report on the work of USSR Congress of People's deputies in three sections on 14 December. The video report is split into three parts, each covering the work of individual sections.

The initial report begins with reportage from the Palace of Congresses, where the reporter is giving a brief evaluation of events. At 1306 GMT the audio feed accompanying the report is lost. During this time the following are briefly seen speaking: Vorotnikov; Fedorov, an eye surgeon; I.N. Dyakov from Astrakhan; O.M. Annamukhamedov from Turkmen SSR; and V.S. Advadze from Georgian SSR.

At 1311 GMT the audio resumes, with Deputy Travkin of Moscow Oblast beginning to speak on economic reform. Reform is slowing down, he says, and it is not radical enough. Perestroyka is in danger of becoming a continuation of the period of stagnation, he says, noting that it will be 10 years old in 1995. According to travkin, economic restructuring is becoming a goal in itself. Taxes are going up—we are trying to achieve economic recovery at the expense of taxpayers, Travkin states. Economic realities demand new thinking.

At 1313 GMT, S.F. Mamedov, deputy from the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic, SSR, speaks in support of the government program.

At 1315 GMT, V.I. Matviyenko, member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, is interviewed on what women expect from perestroyka. It is women who suffer most from strikes, ethnic strife, bad conditions, and empty shops, she says. The government report fails to address itself to these problems. She praises other aspects of the report, but casts doubt on the feasibility of ambitious undertakings. Matviyenko goes on to say that economists have so far failed to agree on a single, unified, concept of economic recovery. They can have their own views—unanimity in science can be fatal—but the concept ought to be worked out jointly, different views notwithstanding, she says. Matviyenko says she took part in the latest sitting of inter-regional group of deputies, and unanimity of views is absent there.

At 1320 GMT Army General N.I. Popov is interviewed. He is optimistic that bureaucratic methods of management are finished. Army Colonel L.S. Shustko, agrees: The Army is always with the people, it is a part of the people, he says.

At 1322 GMT Muhamad Sadik Muhamad Yusuf from Uzbekistan says his Republic is not satisfied with government report. They would like cotton purchasing prices to go up, along with other purchasing prices, so that the Central Asian and Kazakhstan people can feel better and have more money. He says that he will vote against the government program if it is unresolved.

At 1323 GMT, A. Ya. Tsirulis, editor of a Baltic newspaper, says that perestroyka as a concept is abused. Many use the word, but do nothing to restructure themselves. What he wants is a discussion on how to move forward fastest. The Law on Ownership must be passed, but everyone is talking of what we cannot or must not do. Perestroyka entails changes; let's have these changes, he urges.

1324 GMT

LD1512204489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1324 GMT on 15 December continues to broadcast a recorded video report on the work of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in sections on 14 December.

At 1324 GMT, Deputy Premier Voronin sums up preliminary results of the discussion. The video report on the first section ends at this time.

At 1326 GMT reportage is carried from the Great Kremlin Palace on the work of the section in charge of stages of economic reform. An unidentified woman outlines the agenda of section's work.

At 1327 GMT V.M. Vologzhin says reform ought to proceed faster.

At 1330 GMT M.M. Kushnerenko, from Kherson Oblast, begins to speak. He says half of the rural population is elderly, and they want to know what will happen to them when land has been given away. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes help them now, but what will happen later? Kushnerenko says he is worried about welfare provisions for rural dwellers.

At 1331 GMT P.G. Bunich from Moscow says the government is quite aware of the dire situation of the economy. It is making many sacrifices, but these exceptional actions can only be successful if the reform is based upon a firm, definite foundation. We should have a law on centralization and methodology, he says.

At 1334 GMT A.V. Levashev from Leningrad says he wants more better quality goods to be produced. The national economy must be opened to world markets, so that good samples of foreign output can reach the market, he states. The ruble ought to be made convertible, and it ought to be gold-standard linked, says Levashev.

At 1336 GMT A.A. Sobchak takes the floor, saying he is not satisfied with the government program. It is a declaration, not a program, he states. It lacks the ability to make ends meet; it provides for emergency measures to be carried out by purely administrative methods. There is no mechanism for implementing the various stages of economic reform.

At 1338 GMT N.G. Bobritskiy says he does not think much of the taxation system. Enterprises adopt artifically low plans to minimize their risks, he says. Incomes are incommensurate with output, and there is no real competition. There are, however, powerful monopoly structures, Bobritskiy states

At 1340 GMT M.B. Mirgazyamov from Bashkir ASSR takes the floor. He says state regulation of the economy must not disappear altogether. The concepts for economic recovery appear all too often to be arbitrary and ill thought-out. Ownership diversity should be the normal state of affairs and should not be regarded as a transition period, he says.

At 1342 GMT, A.S. Samsonov from Moscow says our new laws do not work or are not observed. Who, for instance, will be responsible if the law on leasing, due to come into force on 1 January 1990, is not observed, he asks. The same is the case with other issues, planning policy, centralized planning, state orders, and so forth.

At 1345 GMT M.I. Lisitskiy from Nikolayev says a mechanism ought to be created for making sure that stages of economic reform are implemented without fail.

At 1346 GMT V.F. Nikolaychuk from Norilsk criticizes the previous stagnation.

At 1347 GMT M.I. Ibragimov from Uzbekistan praises opportunities created for the republic by economic reform. Regional aspects ought to have been taken more into account, he says.

At 1349 GMT YE.F. Novikov is interviewed on the desirability of greater personal involvement of deputies in what is going on.

At 1350 GMT V.F. Kharitonov is interviewed, and says he is satisfied with the work of the section and government program.

At 1351 GMT A.A. Genchev says much work is yet to be done, but on the whole he is satisfied.

At 1352 GMT A.G. Kostenyuk says that he cannot yet see any stages of economic reform as such. We have several variants of reform, a model of economic reform. The established goals are correct, he says. Discipline and interaction must be enhanced. Mechanisms must be created to ensure that this is done, on pain of large penalties.

1355 GMT

LD1512204589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1355 GMT on 15 December continues to broadcast a recorded video report on the work of the USSR People's Congress Deputies in sections on 14 December.

At 1355 GMT the report switches to the work of the third section in the Palace of Congresses. Valeriy Golubev introduces himself as a correspondent from "Vremya." He says that he will present the work of the section elaborating principled approaches for the 13th 5-year plan. Before he does so, he very briefly interviews several deputies prior to the section's sitting. More than 700 deputies are present in the hall.

At 1358 GMT Maslyukov opens the sitting with a speech.

At 1402 GMT Borodin criticizes health protection. He mentions various figures and says he wants medical insurance to pay for costs.

At 1403 GMT Trubilin says the incidence of illness is too high. Enterprises must reward those who have a good attendance record.

At 1405 GMT Deputy Zakhayev from Moldavia advocates greater accountability of rural workers.

At 1410 GMT and unidentified deputy says wages are too low. This affects young people especially. Unemployment is making itself felt among young people in Central Asia. A proper program to tackle youth problems is needed, he says.

At 1414 GMT Deputy Yablokov says environment protection is a priority. Let us eliminate causes of illnesses, he says.

At 1415 GMT Deputy Petrokov welcomes the fact that the plan is geared to the needs of the public. But steps mapped out, especially in the area of changing investments policy, are not resolute enough, he says. We must find a place for ourselves in the international division of labor.

At 1417 GMT Kariyeva says culture ought to be further subsidized. It ought to feature more in the various programs debated here. We must not save money here, he says.

At 1420 GMT Deputy Krutov says short term goals are okay, but insufficient attention is paid to long term goals. Forty percent of labor is wasted. Imported equipment costs a lot. Living conditions are intolerable. In the area of production he says, we are guided by a theory that stopped developing as long ago as at the start at the 1920's. In terms of average life span, we occupy the 59th place in the world. Our fellow countrymen die when the average Japanese happily goes on pension and begins to enjoy life. All our crises are a consequence of our spiritual hopelessness. Physical health, material wellbeing, ecological situation—this is what should serve as criteria of progress now, and not kilometres, tonnes and so forth.

The report ends at 1425 GMT.

Congressional Sections' Debates Summarized

PM1512174189 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 Dec 89 pp 1-2

[TASS report: "Time for Decisions, Time for Actions"]

[Text] USSR people's deputies were given an additional opportunity for an in-depth exchange of opinions on fundamental problems of the socioeconomic situation in the country 14 December. On that day the Second Congress worked not just in one forum but in three forums at once. Work was being done in the sections.

The fact that people's deputies attach crucial importance to the need to extricate the country from the crisis was proved by their keenness to attend the work of the congress section which discussed measures for the Soviet economy's recovery. About 800 deputies registered to participate in its work. About 250 of them persistently asked to be given the floor.

In these conditions it was important to utilize the parliamentary forum's potential as effectively as possible. And the debate immediately took on a specific nature. Without wasting time to paraphrase what is universally known, deputies focused their attention on proposals by means of which they strove to impart additional dynamism to the measures proposed by the government.

It was no accident that a large group of speakers spoke in detail of the need to enhance discipline at all levels, from workplaces to contractual relations between enterprises and sectors. Attention was focused on this issue specifically by Deputies Ya.P. Kulikov, T.K. Pupkevich, V.N. Kovalev, and others. They emphasized that the implementation of the government measures for economic recovery would be impossible without unity of intention and action, citing specific examples from the experience of their enterprises and farms to back this thesis.

A large group of questions concerned the improvement of economic accountability relations. For example, Deputy A.P. Yanenko proposed that auction sales of quotas be introduced in view of the country's difficulties with material and technical supplies. This, he believes, would provide a serious incentive for boosting efficiency in all spheres of economic management.

Having pointed out the specific features of our economy's transitional stage, the deputy voiced the idea that what society needs most of all now is a guaranteed minimum of goods and foodstuffs. Consequently, he believes, a coupon system of distribution is also necessary. Workers should earn identical pay for identical work performed in state and cooperative enterprises. The speaker also proposed a series of measures for the social protection of those whose earnings are fixed.

In order to more rapidly implement the measures proposed by the government, the USSR Council of Ministers must be given special powers in the sphere of economic recovery, Deputy E.Kh. Gukasov declared. He submitted a proposal that the elaboration of a package of laws providing the basis of social production should be completed and adopted during the first quarter, and he substantiated the need for the earliest possible transition to new wholesale purchase prices, emphasizing that unless these measures are taken the path chosen to overcome the crisis would prove too long. The deputy believes that a series of proposals contained in the government report must be explained and amplified.

Specifically, he said, there is a lack of sufficiently seriously conceived measures to boost the growth of consumer goods manufacture. The union shifts this tasks to the republics, the republics—to the oblasts, and so on. Consequently there are no guarantees that this crucial program will be implemented in the planned volume.

The report's section dealing with intensification of the economy's material balance must be reworked and amplified, according to Deputy V.-E.G, Bresis. It was from these positions that the head of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic government analyzed in detail the present state of the national economy in Latvia and the other Baltic republics which are switching to the principles of regional economic accountability. Furthermore, the speaker believes, the USSR Council of Ministers must promptly adopt a resolution on the procedure for handing enterprises over to the republics, precisely defining their rights in the expansion of foreign economic ties. Starting with the next 5-year plan, fundamentally new approaches will have to be adopted toward the interaction between union republic budgets and the

USSR budget. These new relations should reflect the internationalism of our economy in the era of perestroyka.

Deputy S.N. Fedorov presented his colleagues with an original lesson in socialist enterprise based on examples from the activity of the "Mikrokhirurgiya Glaza" [Microsurgery of the Eye] Intersector Scientific and Technical Complex. He called for the utmost assistance in the development of lease relations, emphasizing in the process that transition to these relations should begin not with the weak but, on the contrary, with strong and efficient enterprises.

Distortions in the distribution of productive forces by regions were correctly identified as one of the important aspects of overcoming "chokepoints" in the economy. Deputies T. Nazarov, I.N. Dyakov, A. Annamukhamedov, and K.A. Melnik raised questions associated with changing prices for a series of raw material categories and proposed practical measures designed to overcome departmental monopolism at local level and to accelerate the solution of the most pressing socioeconomic problems.

Specifically, an idea was voiced about the need to elaborate at government level regional employment programs which are especially needed by Central Asian republics now. It is necessary, deputies said, to create a material fund for those who are learning new vocations as a result of plant and farm conversion, and for those who are temporarily not participating in social production. It is especially important to provide social support for young people making their way in life.

Participants in the debate were not unanimous in their perception of the program proposed by the country's government to extricate the economy from its critical state. Some perceive it as a clear-cut system which would make it possible to impose order in the socialist market. Others do not believe that the proposed measures would change the situation or would produce a radical change for the better in Soviet people's life. Deputies R.A. Satybaldiyev, V.K. Mesyats, I.I. Zbykovskiy, V.S. Advadze, and others specifically proposed a quest for nontraditional approaches as part of an overall development concept, expressing at times diametrically opposite views regarding the ways to achieve economic equilibrium.

But the majority of speakers were unanimous that now it is exceptionally important to overcome the consequences of the years-long domination of the administrative-edict system. It was emphasized that the main barrier to this is the stereotyped thinking in production relations. Only by casting off the fetters of obsolete notions of mutual relations in society, the speakers said, will we be able to achieve weighty results.

One of the manifestations of outmoded attitudes is the stubborn unwillingness of the relevant departments to base their plans not on percentages, tonnes, or meters but on the real needs and concerns of people who expect perestroyka to change their life for the better. Therefore, enumerating possible measures which could have a substantial effect on the future of each and every one of us, the speakers advocated a sharp turn by the entire intellectual potential of the state toward the solution of the main tasks.

An idea was expressed about formulating a law on labor which would provide the greatest possible incentives for stepping up highly productive creative work. There was talk of the need to introduce the annual recertification of management cadres, which would create a healthy competition in this environment.

Wishes were expressed to create regional financial markets, gearing their potential to the production of goods and services. Deputy N.N. Pribylova specifically proposed a more vigorous development of the tourist industry so as to earn additional foreign currency revenue from this source and channel it toward the improvement of health care and the solution of society's other social problems.

The detailed examination of the report was often accompanied by sharp criticism of its provisions. Deputy N.I. Travkin voiced the opinion that the radical economic reform is losing its radical nature and today is—in his words—nothing but "a leisurely darning of holes in the economy." The speaker believes: The desire to balance the economy is becoming a goal in itself, while man's interests continue to be infringed. Attempts are made, he said, to shear producers so close to the skin that the wool has no chance to grow, while the proposed tax system altogether kills off any desire to work.

The opportunity for radical economic reform in 1990 has been missed, the deputy declared, but the utmost acceleration of the adoption of the main bloc of laws—and the congress must instruct the Supreme Soviet accordingly—would help us not to miss the opportunity to use this year as a preparatory period for launching the reform in 1991. It must be admitted that the formula "commodity-money-market" is not a capitalist trick but a universal human attribute. That is when we will find our way out of the blind alley.

Deputy M.S. Surkov touched on a problem which is topical for thousands of people. The government, he said, must show greater concern for military personnel's daily life. The situation with housing, women's employment, and children's education remains as bad as ever. Reductions in the Armed Forces must be accompanied by a more clear-cut social program for those who are leaving the army ranks.

In Deputy Z.P. Krylova's opinion, the government report does not adequately cover one important aspect—consideration of the interests of specific population groups and of women in particular. Their position is directly linked with the general social and economic crisis. Hard monotonous labor is becoming the "privilege" of women. It is a matter not only of feminizing unskilled labor but also of feminizing poverty and, in the long run, of feminizing unemployment.

Deputy D.S. Mironova believes that the measures for economic recovery should include another subsection containing measures for the juridical and economic protection of Soviet women. This view is also shared by Deputy V.I. Matviyenko, who devoted her speech to problems concerning protection of the family, motherhood, and childhood.

Participants in the debate analyzed in depth the entire package of problems associated with accelerating the countryside's development, with the solution of the food problem emerging as a direct consequence thereof. Deputies A.R. Atadzhanov, A.M. Yemelyanov, I.A. Tolstoukhov, R.P. Rugin, and others examined the broad range of approaches toward economic recovery in the agro-industrial complex, from the introduction of market relations in some regions by way of an experiment, to large-scale ecological measures designed to protect nature and its wealth from departmental arbitrariness.

The broad debate on one of the most acute problems of society's life produced useful material, intended to enrich the comprehensive program proposed by the government for the country's economic recovery and the strengthening of perestroyka's material base.

At the end of the debate, L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, replied to deputies' questions.

The report presented by the government gives much attention to substantiating the sequence of the economic reform's stages. Indeed, our entire economy's recovery will depend on the scheduling of chronological priorities in shaping the new economic mechanism and the consistency with which the planned measures are implemented. The sitting of the section which discussed the stages of the economic reform examined in depth the actual questions of the tactics of economic perestroyka. More than 200 deputies—economists, enterprise leaders, and jurists—participated in the debate.

The implementation of the reforms demands comprehensiveness of approach, decisiveness, and stability; halfhearted measures are useless. In the opinion of V.M. Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Economic Reform Committee, we all must be fully aware of this reality today when embarking on work which is so important for the future of perestroyka. The deputy described as a sad result of its first 4 years the adoption of so-called emergency measures, and specifically the 15-month suspension of a series of articles of the Law on the State Enterprise, the introduction of taxation of the growth of enterprises' wage funds, and other measures which were somewhat reminiscent of the causes of the failures and even the collapse of economic transformations between the early sixties and late seventies.

The speaker expressed his opinion on the reform concept proposed by the government and on its components. He perceives as one of the program's substantial flaws the insufficiently clear vision of the mechanism for state regulation of the economy. Certain provisions of this important link of the reform are only identified and declared, without being backed by legal norms. For example, just talking about the mobilization of state reserves to stabilize the market and prices or about the regulation of money supply and credit deposits by using bank interest rates and fixed exchange rate normatives [normativy rezervirovaniya valyutnykh kursov] is nothing but a general presentation of the question. There is not a single word about how this goal is to be attained and what methods are to be chosen.

Analyzing the specific features of the reform's individual stages, deputies made different appraisals of the possible effect of measures planned by the government. Some believe that the key to success at all stages should be provided by the formula of strengthening discipline at all costs, including familiar slogans like "All hands to the pumps." Others place emphasis on a clear-cut system of economic measures. In their opinion, the workers' apathy can be overcome and their labor yield encouraged only on the basis of the working people's real material interest. This is not at all a question of average wages but a matter of what proportion of revenues is left for the enterprise, for the producer. Deputy N.G. Bobritskiy is convinced that any other methods for nurturing an enterprise worker's sense ownership are illusory.

Deputy A.V. Levashev spoke of the main points where the lever of force ought to be applied in order to deal with the mountain of problems facing the country. His answer to the question "What is the main obstacle in the path of reform?" was harsh enough: Working people are not interested, they are unable and unwilling to work. And no matter what we say about enhanced material incentives and even about sharp wage rises, these incentives will not work until such time as we start producing more and better goods.

But Deputy M.M. Kushnerenko believes that it should not be just a working person's personal interest that governs the economy's renewal in this difficult economic situation. Equal importance is attached today to each and every one's moral responsibility for the situation in the country and a high standard of labor discipline. In this context the speaker specifically proposed that the USSR Supreme Soviet proclaim a moratorium on strikes throughout 1990. This proposal was backed by I.Ya. Yerokhovets and other deputies.

In the course of the debate the floor was taken by famous economists—theoreticians and practitioners, leaders of major industrial and agricultural enterprises, and representatives of union republics and autonomous formations. Basically the conversation was to the point, but many speakers went beyond the framework of the section's topic. A broad range of issues was raised in speeches—from the creation of a "Book of Remembrance" to the salvation of the Black Sea, which is experiencing an ecological crisis. Consequently V.S. Shevchenko, who was in the chair, was forced to repeatedly remind speakers not to digress from the problem under discussion. To a certain extent, in the opinion of participants in the sitting, the digression from the main topic was due to the absence of a clear substantiation of the reform's stages in the actual government report.

The conception of the transition to market relations was also named as a weak spot of the program submitted by the government. It is vaguely defined in terms of both schedule and substance. In addition, the proposed emergency measures give no confidence in the subsequent emancipation of the economy and the transition to market conditions. Different opinions on this subject were expressed by P.G. Bunich, A.A. Sobchak, and many others.

Deputy K.G. Nosov, appraising the prevailing situation, said: In conditions whereby our market is sliding further toward the level of a barter system, we can no longer accept the report's words that the market is nothing but an elaboration of general rules of economic behavior. The general director of the "Krivorozhstal" Combine emphasized that he, in his capacity as a producer, does not share the government's fears about the threat of the national economic balance being disrupted as a result of the development of a market economy. State orders, he amplified, can be placed on a competitive basis and on terms that are more advantageous for enterprises—in other words they can thus become an organic part of relations dictated by the market.

Many fundamental laws which should ensure the normal progress of reform, deputies emphasized, and specifically the laws on ownership and on land, have not yet been adopted. The meaning of the Law on Leasing, which has been adopted and which gives the go-ahead to new forms of economic management, is being emasculated. Only 2 out of 24 basic economic laws have been adopted. In this context, calls were made from the rostrum to adopt all the necessary legislative acts in 1990, and not by 1993 as the government proposes. Many speakers are convinced that this is the only way to dispel fears that the reform will not work during the 13th 5-Year Plan period.

Incidentally, some participants in the debate were not inclined to absolutize the idea of providing full legal backing for the reform. Thus, Deputy A.S. Kapto assumes that the new economic mechanism will be brought into operation not by resolutions, not by laws as such, but by specific people whose level of professional literacy, economic thinking, and legal awareness will determine whether the mechanism will start functioning or not. In this context he spoke of the need to fundamentally change attitudes toward the problem of consolidating the cadre and, especially, the scientific potential of perestroyka. Deputy V.D. Sidorenko is convinced that there is a need for more effective levers encouraging enterprises to invest funds in the development of culture and, in parallel with the economic reform, to display concern for man—otherwise, in his words, perestroyka will have to meander fruitlessly through a countless multitude of stages. Immoral and uncultured people, the speaker emphasized, cannot think critically, and our economic and political programs will be smashed to pieces against a wall of incomprehension and aggressiveness.

To a certain extent the critical tone of many speeches was balanced by other speakers' appraisals recognizing the government program's merits. For example, Deputy V.I. Lisitskiy described the proposed measures as fully adequate to ensure that the ship of our economy returns to an even keel and gathers pace. One debate participant remarked: It is a very impressive fact that the government has spoken out precisely and unambiguously on a series of fundamental and crucial concepts. A sizable proportion of speakers perceived as an important positive element the recognition of the diversity and equality of forms of ownership and the government's desire for closer cooperation with parliament in the elaboration of the package of perestroyka's basic laws.

Nonetheless, it must be admitted that many participants in the debate raised doubts about the possibility of such constructive collaboration. For example, Deputy V.F. Nikolaychuk asked: Are we not likely to prejudge the fate of the laws on property, on land, and on the socialist enterprise if we were to approve now such a rigid model for a way out of the crisis? He backed the proposal that the congress should go no further than taking note of the government's program and instructing the Supreme Soviet to create a favorable legislative regime for the legal backing of radical changes next year.

At the end of the debate, L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, delivered a speech explaining the government's stand on a series of issues raised.

More than 700 deputies registered to take part in the work of the section which discussed fundamental approaches to the drafting of the 13th 5-Year Plan.

In a way, the tone for the ensuing debate was set by the speech by Yu.D. Maslyukov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee [Gosplan]. Deputies, he remarked, will have to chose a clearly defined path of development and the government will have to follow it. If it were to be the option proposed by N.I. Ryzhkov, then we would ask that the planned measures be approved and that we are given the necessary powers. It is necessary to understand: Economic recovery, the stages of the reform, and the shaping of the next 5-year plan are inseparably interconnected links of a single system.

The national economic structure requires a thorough review, it needs to address itself to man, the Gosplan leader went on, reminding deputies that the social sphere's development will inevitably require additional industrial, fuel, and energy resources. The main task is to correctly define priorities and only then to tackle the distribution of capital investments and material resources. It is necessary to harmoniously combine market relations with state regulation, to clearly define the framework of centralized planning.

The speaker touched on the specific tasks of reducing the national economy's materials- and energy-intensiveness, improving the investment process, stabilizing collaboration between the center and the localities, and enhancing ecological safety. The government, he emphasized, intends to solve the problem of balancing the plan by reducing the level of the state order to 90 percent. The remaining output will be used to gradually organize the market. It will be necessary to reinforce the levers for influencing enterprises so as to halt the process of declining discipline during the transitional period, so as to consolidate the whole of society for the solution of complex socioeconomic tasks.

"Trying to grab more than their fair share"—unfortunately this expression, which was repeatedly used by debate participants, was typical of many speeches. The majority of deputies were clearly inclined not so much to discuss the necessary changes in planning practice but to draw attention to the acute problems of their own region or sector.

Participants in the discussion focused their attention primarily on the development of the social sphere. Yu.I. Borodin, chairman of the Health Committee, who devoted his speech to health care problems, spoke of the need to increase appropriations for it and to mobilize additional resources from the production sphere. He also proposed that medicine be transferred to the insurance principle. Deputy N.T. Trubilin emphasized the need to involve enterprises' efforts in social development. When evaluating their work, in the speaker's opinion, indicators of working people's health must also be taken into account.

Tajikistan, Deputy D.Kh. Karimov declared, finds itself at a disadvantage in the prevailing exchanges. In order to eliminate the concealed exploitation of republics whose economies are geared to raw materials, it is necessary to begin the 13th 5-Year Plan period with new prices. The speaker drew attention to the question of land irrigation and water utilization, and proposed the drafting of an all-union program of employment of the population. Deputy B.F. Rakhimova pointed out the difficult situation of women in Central Asia. Having expressed alarm at the rising infant mortality there, she proposed the adoption of an all-union program to combat this tragic phenomenon.

Agrarians had their weighty say during the debate. Deputies A.I. Dubko, I.M. Aksenov, V.A. Gontar, A.G. Zhdanov, and others spoke about the halfhearted measures proposed by the government for the further development of the agro-industrial complex. So many problems have accumulated in this complex now that, unless there is a radical change of approach, time will be lost—but the main point is that the countryside itself might be lost. It was noted that many peasants object to attacks on collective and state farms and to the prospects of restoring private ownership of land—this would be as hasty as the collectivization of the thirties. This question must be decided by those who work on the land.

A paradoxical situation prevails in relations between the city and the countryside, the speaker pointed out. Purchase prices for agricultural produce must be raised in 1990, because any delay would aggravate the already complex situation. Deputy V.A. Masol proposed tackling primarily the strengthening of loss-making farms and the introduction of new economic relations there. Unfortunately, the planned renewal of the agro-industrial complex' material and technical base and the priority development of the countryside's social sphere are not backed by resources and equipment not only in the long term but not even in 1990.

Deputies G.N. Podberezskiy and N.V. Yablonko pointed out that the countryside's social problems cannot be solved without help from the industrial enterprises. We ought not to get carried away with reforms in the agrarian sector. While keeping the grain in mind, the grain growers must not be forgotten.

Many participants in the discussion expressed fears about the proposed freeze on the development of the base sectors. Such a project, Deputy V.V. Bushuyev said, could only be conceived behind closed office doors. There is no need to set Groups "A" and "B" against each other—they are two wheels of the economy which can advance only provided they both turn in synchronization. As for attempts to ride on just one wheel, a circus is the only suitable place for them.

Young people are a socially and economically deprived group of the population, Deputy V.I. Tsybukh believes. Their average wages around the country are one-half the wages of other population groups. Social tension is exacerbated by poor standards of education, expenditure on which is considerably lower than in industrially developed countries. Young people are the first victims of unemployment, especially in Central Asia and some other regions. Spiritual values are undergoing transformations, faith in the ideals of socialism is being undermined. There is a need for a targeted state policy, and its implementation must be undertaken right away. Deputy N.V. Bosenko, on the other hand, called for plans to give more attention to the needs of veterans and low-income strata of the population.

Deputy N.V. Karlov emphasized that any country's capital is made up of highly educated people and a developed science. It is necessary to give substantially more attention to the problems of education and the development of scientific research, including fundamental research. An improvement of the situation in the education sphere could be promoted by municipalization provided, of course, there is an increase in state expenditure for this purpose. Our long-suffering culture also needs guaranteed sources of finance in Deputy B.R. Kareyeva's opinion.

Cardinal problems concerning the improvement of planning and the changing of its functions were touched on by Deputies A.K. Orlov and N.Ya. Petrakov. It must be admitted, they said, that centralized planning cannot cover all spheres of production. The diversity of forms of ownership demands pluralism of the forms of economic management.

Every now and then the discussion turned from the next 5-year plan to the present day. This is understandable: The economy's current problems were knocking loudly on the doors of the Palace of Congresses, and planning the future would be senseless unless they are solved.

This was how the issues were presented by Deputies A.V. Yablokov and V.P. Nosov, who spoke about ecological disasters and the need for a new scheme to manage the utilization of natural resources; G.I. Revenko, who touched on the problems of the struggle against economic mismanagement and the strengthening of labor discipline; and A.N. Krutov, who emphasized: When setting the goals, the criterion can no longer be tonnes or kilometers but the standard of the physical and moral health of the people and the economy.

Yu.D. Maslyukov replied to numerous questions raised during the discussion.

The results of the sharp and principled debates in the sections have not yet been summed up. This will be done at a plenary sitting of the congress Friday morning.

Congress Forms Drafting Commissions

PM1512142389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Congress Commissions"]

[Text] The following drafting commissions were formed at the Congress:

the Commission for Further Work on the Standing Orders of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and USSR Supreme Soviet. (Chairman Yu.Kh. Kalmykov)

the Commission To Prepare the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies Draft Resolution on the USSR Council of Ministers' Report "On Measures To Improve the Economy, the Stages of the Economic Reform, and Fundamental Approaches to the Elaboration of the 13th 5-Year Plan." (Chairman N.N. Slyunkov)

the Commission for Further Work on the Draft Legislative Acts Defining the Status of People's Deputies in the USSR, the Status of USSR People's Deputies, and Other Issues Connected with Deputies' Activities. (Chairman N.D. Pivovarov)

the Commission for Further Work on the Draft USSR Law on Changes and Amendments to the USSR Constitution (Basic Law) with regard to the Issues of the Electoral System. (Chairman Yu.A. Manayenkov)

the Commission for Further Work on the Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR (Chairman D. Kerimov)

the Commission To Prepare the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies Draft Resolution on Stepping Up the Fight Against Organized Crime. (Chairman V.I. Semenko)

Deputies' Speeches, Conduct Criticized

PM1512123189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Report by PRAVDA Parliamentary Observer Miroslav Buzhkevich: "Putting the Time to Good Use. The Congress: Day By Day"]

[Text] When I reached the balcony of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers' Hall of Sessions I got this very familiar sensation. Not surprisingly. There had been two parliamentary sessions in the hall—4 months of intensive work. It had made its mark not only on us, the journalists who were there, but primarily, of course, on the members of the Supreme Soviet. They have become more experienced and many of them are now setting an example of mature argument and balanced judgment at the congress.

The program submitted by the government on measures to improve the economy and on the stages of economic reform and fundamental approaches to the elaboration of the 13th 5-year plan were minutely analyzed by the deputies yesterday and the day before yesterday, with some of them approving it and others voicing objections and even rejecting it. In a snap interview for PRAVDA N.I. Ryzhkov said that he wanted his report to provoke constructive, practical criticism. Have these expectations been borne out? As yet by no means entirely, alas.

Of course, there was a number of hard-hitting speeches during the debate. The speakers were mainly criticizing shortcomings, and sometimes very penetratingly and with justification—but there were few constructive proposals. Some reckon that the methods whereby it is planned to improve the economy are those that led to its weakening. Planning must be carried out not on the basis of what has been achieved, but on the basis of what is sufficient, and the dimensions of this "sufficiency" must be accurately determined.

But there were fewer constructive proposals during the debate than one would have liked. Why? Yu. Gninenko, people's deputy and forestry specialist from Shchuchinsk, Kokchetav Oblast, said that many of his colleagues see the congress platform as a magic place where your wishes are granted. Well put. Both in the debate that began after the government report and in yesterday's discussion inertia was very much in evidence in the thinking. Old, not new thinking, of course.

Some of the speeches could be called speeches from the past. First the speaker would trot out facts and figures about the wretched situation in his oblast, republic, or sector, then he would propose that a little space be found in the government's economic program for measures to eliminate these shortcomings, forgetting that what we are concerned with is principles, with a main axis assault. If

I were asked to draw a harmless caricature of this "principled" petitioner, I would draw him standing on the platform, arm outstretched, ending in a large scoop, the type you see on an excavator, with the word "Gimme" written on it.

But, seriously, the deputies must not waste time. This is precisely what one of their colleagues wrote to a section presidium, suggesting that they stop making "self-accountability" and "begging" speeches but go to the platform only to evaluate the substance of the government program and make constructive proposals on how to improve the country's economy more effectively. It would be nice if those who participate in the debate today were to respond to this appeal.

You may think I am persisting rather, but I sense an urgent need to return to the topic of emotions and ethics, which has featured before in my notes. The delegates had not gotten over the ugly scene caused by a certain Lithuanian deputy's emotional statement, when something similar happened the next evening. The discussion was about the composition of the editorial commissions for individual draft laws. One deputy demanded an explanation why the names of certain leaders keep on appearing in the lists. And in a highly excited and totally unwarranted tone he asked not to be interrupted because "he had been refused the floor before." In other words, he did his utmost to charge the atmosphere of the sitting. When the chairman explained that this had been done specifically in order to maintain continuity between the said commissions and the main one that prepared the drafts of all congress documents, it was clear that there was no one to "expose."

This episode lasted a matter of minutes, but it left a nasty taste in many mouths. As does the desire of some people to get to the platform at all costs, as does the appearance of two speakers on the patform at the same time, and other "trifles" which upset the majority of deputies and make them embarrassed for their colleagues. One wonders whether it is a conscious desire to cause tension in the hall or evidence that some people's deputies have not yet become true statesmen.

Deputies Hit for Lack of Radical Ideas on Economy

PM1512122589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 1

[P. Voshchanov and S. Kiselev article under the rubric "From Our Parliamentary Correspondents": "No Highlights, No Ideas"]

[Text] The economy is like a forest, where every tree has its own height and its place. In which old trees die, leaving space for new ones. Everything is balanced, everything is reasonable. But then a "proprietor" comes along, presumptuously announcing that he himself knows what can grow and what cannot. And he prescribes his own order and standard for everything. What is superfluous is cut down. And the forest dies, the economy withers: Shelves are empty and the ruble is lighter than a feather....

What is to be done? Yesterday's congress session, which was devoted to discussing the government program to improve the economy, should have provided the answer to this. What is its essence? To be brief: In the current phase, it is necessary to find the correct interpretation for administrative and market methods for managing the economy.

In the opinion of N.I. Ryzhkov, who gave a report on this subject, intolerance toward changes and hastiness in their implementation have now closed in and are hindering the creation of a new economy.

It is not worth going through all the provisions of the government program again. Of course, it must be studied; the document deserves that. And yet it is marked by a certain duplicity of position, which gives rise to the feeling of an organized retreat into "previously assigned positions."

It must be said that some deputies who stepped onto the platform yesterday planned their speeches in a very idiosyncratic way, in the spirit of the worst traditions of our economic aktiv meetings which are held everywhere. First they suddenly demand that the government allocate additional fuel oil, then that they cast their minds to the disastrous situation at some museum of regional studies. A deputy from Uzbekistan, for instance, deemed it necessary to pose a question about formulating measures to improve the socioeconomic living conditions of the indigenous population of the old Tashkent. There is no doubt that all these are important questions, that they are even of paramount importance. People are demanding that they be resolved and do not want to be satisfied with optimistic assurances, as was the case before: Give us time, and we'll resolve everything! But is it right to put these questions to the supreme organ of state power? How can this be reconciled with the process of local self-government?

There were speeches whose essence can be defined by one word: self-congratulation. Tonnes, kilometers, and millions of rubles, a whole mass of all kinds of figures which show the results of what was achieved in the past few years. And they only skimmed over how to get out of the crisis.

What did we want to hear yesterday from our deputies? New original, bold, radical ideas. They should have outlined the future economy. But alas, this did not happen. It seemed that the speakers did not listen to the report by the head of the government, and only spoke about the things bothering them.

Alas, most of us have grown up with the feeling of the individual citizen's impotence—if not uselessness, to put it more harshly. From platforms high and low they liked to remind us, opportunely or not, that a housewife apparently can and should get involved in governing the state. But in real life everything was different, and could be defined by the practical question: "But what can I do?" All of this is still within us. What can be done—a person cannot be transformed overnight.

But can we measure our deputies by the same yardstick? After all, they are entrusted not just with their seats and our votes. They are entrusted with our future. And we must not think about our future by looking back at yesterday every minute, and sighing with regret.

Moscow TV Relays 15 Dec Congressional Session

1500 GMT

LD1512155489

[Editorial Report] Moscow TV Service in Russian at 1500 GMT on 15 December carries a recorded relay of the morning session of the Second Congress of USSR.

At 1500 GMT session Chairman Vorotnikov, flanked by Gorbachev and Lukyanov, announces the death of Sakharov and pays tribute to him. Vorotnikov then announces a minute's silence in his honor.

At 1502 GMT Academician Likhachev pays tribute to Sakharov. He asks that all deputies be given the opportunity to attend the funeral.

At 1503 GMT Vorotnikov says that 1,878 deputies have registered. Vorotnikov tells of yesterday's proceedings in sections and announces the agenda for today: to discuss Ryzhkov's report.

At 1504 GMT Deputy Paton discusses the investment process and its influence on the environment. This has not been sufficiently taken into account in the plans. Resource-saving programs would allow a reduction in investment in material and energy-producing capacities. The population is opposed to the construction of nuclear power stations. He calls for more reliable nuclear stations to be developed. In the meantime, gas-powered stations should be used. Scientific and technological progress should be pursued energetically, Paton explains. He says the government should be allowed to get on with its work.

At 1519 GMT Danilyuk comes to the rostrum.

1519 GMT

LD1512162589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December morning session of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1519 GMT Danilyuk says that the congress should set a definite program of actions. The people are waiting to be given a lead. Reformists and conservatives should cease their hostile attitudes and give support to the program set out by Ryzhkov. Glasnost has led to all sorts of disruptions and disorders. Further actions are needed to improve the lot of the people of the Far East. Raw materials must remain the basis of the far east's economy but resources must be treated with greater respect. Timber resources are being abused. The region does not recieve sufficient return in exchange for its materials. Local fuel deposits should be developed. A Soviet-U.S. enterprise should be set up to develop the Sakhalin shelf deposits.

At 1536 GMT Menshatov talks about the profitability of farms and the need to give rural workers greater prestige, resources, etc. He calls for more emphasis on cooperatives and leasing. Land must be inheritable to give peasants the incentive to work the land. Leaseholders are being given a poor deal and their conditions should be improved, he says.

At 1546 GMT Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, says that the legislative process in the Supreme Soviet has been too slow so far. Basic laws on the economic reform remain unadopted. The Baltic area is dissatisfied with the progress so far. One way out is to leave the union. Another way is to restore confidence. The Latvian Supreme Soviet is much better placed to defend the interests of the republic as its voice often gets lost among the large other republics of the union. Republican laws should have priority within the republic. Defense questions are a union matter but the formation of the army is a matter for discussion. It must be with the people. In Latvia there have been cases of disrespect for the Army. Alternative services should be available for conscripts. Latvians should be permitted to serve in republican units. The problem of providing housing for demobilized officers is under discussion; Latvia will give preference to its own inhabitants.

At 1600 GMT Filippov says that the Komi deputies have a contradictory attitude to Ryzhkov's report. Alongside positive elements there are negative ones. A monetary reform would harm only the shadow economy and the mafia. It would restore people's trust in the government. He complians at the exploitative methods used by timber enterprises in Komi ASSR. Local inhabitants are incensed and it is contrary to recent decisions on protecting the environment. Financial measures should be taken to make it unprofitable to burn off concomitant gas as is done at oil deposits at present.

He conveys a message to the congress from local miners complaining at misrepresentation of their strikes in the press. He complains at empty shelves in Komi stores, going on to say that the nuclear testing ground on Novaya Zemlya should be removed.

1611 GMT

LD1512171989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1611 GMT Soskovets discusses investment policy and the role of the state order. Conditions should be equal for everyone. There should be more investment in progressive technologies in basic industries. This would be economically advantageous. Enterprises should be allowed to export some of their above-plan output. Metal workers are wondering where resources are being found to pay the miners who went on strike. There should be no preferential treatment for individual groups of workers.

At 1626 GMT Snegur, secretary of the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, says that the report did not give enough attention to the forthcoming transfer of republics to financial autonomy. Reforms and improvements must come about in the union republics and other regions. He is not looking toward isolationism, but local soviets should have control over all enterprises on their territory. Although there is a surplus of labor in Moldavia, various ministries are bringing in labor from other republics to staff their enterprises. This has led to interethnic dissension. The union budget should be based on the republican budgets and not vice-versa as at present. The adoption of laws on property, land, etc. should be adopted more rapidly. Resources should be directed toward reducing avoidable losses.

The Moldavian people condemn strikes; they are no way to solve problems. A good wholesale price system must be developed.

At 1640 GMT Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, says that the important thing is to get the economy out of the state of crisis. The government had a difficult task in drawing up a suitable program. On the whole it has been successful, inspite of criticism from both right and left. However, no long-term measures have been proposed or precise timescale for various reforms. Much is unclear about the social consequences of the reforms. Other socialist countries that have gone further than the USSR are encountering various problems and contradictions. Many decisions remain unfulfilled. In Armenia the consequences of the earthquake and the blockade require extreme measures to resolve them. Many earthquake victims will be spending their second winter in bad conditions. There should be a national system to deal with emergencies.

At 1651 GMT Vorotnikov gives out various procedural notices. He says that all speeches at yesterday's sectional meetings will be published. He then announces a 30-minute interval.

At 1653 GMT the announcer says that there will be a 15-minute break.

1710 GMT

LD1512175489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1710 GMT resumes its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

Vorotnikov announces the creation of a commission for the funeral of Sakharov, chaired by Primakov, Marchuk, Likhachev, Ryabev, Sagdeyev, and Saykin. While the names are being read Gorbachev tells someone to sit down. The deputies agree to the commission.

At 1714 GMT it is decided that the Ryzhkov report will be discussed further by an unidentified deputy from Kirghizia and then Yeltsin. The Kirghiz supports the report on the whole and says that regional programs require a creative approach. He talks of the difficult conditions in Kirghizia—lack of schools, housing, gas provision, lack of electricity, goods, and inflation.

At 1723 GMT he says Kirghiz food-processing industries suffer from a lack of refrigeraters. Kirghizia is not receiving adequate help from the center to combat its problems. Kirghizia has received the right to direct economic contacts with other countries. The Kirghiz deputy calls on the Supreme Soviet not to disappoint the people's hopes and to support the report. He calls for discipline, hard work, responsibility, and development of friendship.

At 1729 GMT Yeltsin starts speaking. He says that we are standing still. Proposals to right the situation were made 3 years ago but were announced to be erroneous. It is time to give an objective picture to society. Gorbachev should have done this. We must find the principle of this economic reform to charge the government to find the only way out of economic crisis. This is already the fifth attempt at reform this decade. There is no guarantee that this reform will work.

At 1737 GMT Yeltsin says we must disassemble the command-administrative system based on lies and hypocrisy. The Soviet person is without rights confronted with the power of the state. Alternate structures must be found. Therefore the proposals of the government should not be approved, but only basic principles.

He says it is important to create the political conditions for people to believe in economic reform. Finally, a concrete plan to disassemble the command-administrative system must be drawn up. Yeltsin considers the next five-year-plan outdated and calls for a program to computerize the country and to create a broad front of cooperation with other countries.

Yeltsin calls for a law to create a multiparty state, referenda, and reform of the KGB and Ministry of Internal Affairs. He supports Zaslavskaya's proposal on Sakharov. He calls for everyone to act according to his conscience.

1742 GMT

LD1512183889

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1742 GMT on 15 December continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1742 GMT an unidentified deputy connected with Leningrad theater begins to speak. He says that his speech will sound trivial after Boris Nikolayevich. He asks where the core of Soviet problems lies He says that it is because the feeling of ownership has been destroyed. Until this is returned nothing will be changed. This does not deny collective labor, but only with the personal interest of all. We need a synonym for the word private. At the moment we have neither bread nor morals.

He says we will not make any changes unless we declare culture to be a priority of our politics. Culture is in danger. Theaters are dying, libraries are being ruined in the country. In Leningrad, the project to restore the city center has not yet been approved. Those who are in charge of culture have had a pay raise, but this is not the way for a renaissance of culture. We are still far from civilization. He is alarmed at deputies' suggestions to cut allocations for culture.

He says he is a communist, but does not want to belong to the same party as those who want to destroy perestroyka. Finally, he talks about in-fighting in cultural circles, especially among writers. He says it is better to be involved in creativity.

At 1757 GMT Vorotnikov suggests listening to Gritsenko on improving the Soviet economy.

At 1759 GMT Gritsenko says that deputies made a profound analysis of Ryzhkov's report. Advadze said that it would not rescue the country from economic crisis. Volkov said that the report has one foot in the old thinking and one in the new. Nazarov suggested experimental testing of economic measures before putting them into general practice. Many deputies have raised the question of accelerating scientific and technical progress.

Gritsenko says that deputy Kovalev has suggested six concrete proposals on improving civil aviation. Fedorov has suggested leasing successful companies which would be competitive on the international market. Surkov has suggested investigating the social problems of the Soviet officer corps.

At 1807 GMT Mesyats suggest actively developing farming activity. There is a suggestion to make agricultural equipment less expensive. Advadze suggests accelerating economic reform by decentralization.

At 1810 GMT Gritsenko says that Deputy Mironov has suggested establishing legal liability for industrial disease. On 28 June of this year Maslykov said that the State Planning Committee would bring in a price-indexing system with social development. The bell rings. Gritsenko asks for 5 more minutes. Vorotnikov asks him to summarize the rest of his speech. He lists the other deputies who have made suggestions. In conclusion he says that the work of section was constructive.

At 1817 GMT Vologzhin, chairman of the section on economic reform, starts to speak. Thirty-three speeches were heard in the section. Deputies Minayev and Kushnerenko said that only general principles and approaches have been established in the area of taxation. There were different opinions on exchange rates. The principle of state orders remains for the next few years based on force. Nikolaychuk and Nosov remarked that principles for creating a socialist market are missing. Sobchak was extremely critical of the report. The speakers were unanimous in the opinion that a balanced economy is not being achieved. The vast majority advocated a special program that would be flexible.

He says the issue of timescales for the reform was discussed in the section. Chernyak and others advocated all the normative legislation being passed by 1992. So-called extraordinary measures were negatively evaluated. A number of deputies drew attention to the fact that economic reform cannot proceed at the same pace throughout the union.

1828 GMT

LD1512185389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1828 GMT Kucherenko is given the floor. He says that he cannot finish his report before the interval. Vorotnikov suggests making the interval now. Kucherenko starts his speech anyway. He says the majority of deputies in his section support the maintenance of extraordinary measures in 1990 and 1991. The second stage for 1992-93 was less well received. Many acute criticisms were made. Contradictory assessments have been made. The opinion was expressed that there are great reserves to develop education, culture, and social amenities and these should be employed. Agriculture have noted that agricultural problems have increased. Deputies have said that the solution of the agricultural problem is crucial to perestroyka.

Kucherenko says deputies corectly noted that it is necessary to change the concentration of production, excluding monopolism, inthe next 5 year plan. Many deputies noted that rationalization of the economy would undoubtedly involve problems of employment.

At 1838 GMT Kucherenko says in the section ecological issues were raised. The bell rings. He says many other questions were raised. A deputy advocated conversion of the military industry. Vorotnikov asks Kuchernko to stop. Kucherenko carries on. He stresses that culture has been ignored in the economic report. This will cost the state even more, the deputies in his section said. A deputy recommended including a youth program in the 13th 5-year plan. He addresses Ryzhkov. He wants the plan to be presented in August and September.

At 1843 GMT Vorotnikov makes organizational announcements for the forthcoming break. After the break Potapov will speak first.

1845 GMT

LD1512194689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1845 GMT Potapov begins speaking. He talks about the economic imbalance in the Soviet Union. He considers that accents should be placed so that scientific and technical progress should be given prime importance. We must get it right or our children will not forgive us. There is not an adequate reaction from the government to the issues of labor discipline. Poor labor discipline undermines production. Potapov does not want discipline with repression. We often praise the West, but there is no industrial anarchy. Potapov ends his speech by criticizing Yeltsin's approach.

At 1857 GMT Deputy Fedyashin says that positive results are needed in the economy over the next 2 years. He praises Ryzhkov report as outlining ways of overcoming problems in economy. He says that discipline is needed and commands are needed as well. He says management methods must produce intensive work. He blames indiscipline and a reduction in plan levels for the destabilization of the economy. He agrees that a reorientation toward the needs of the consumer is right. He says that attention must be paid to what is being said locally in respect of improving production. Production potential will not increase without investments. He says that programs must unfailingly be implemented. He speaks of the need for investments in the agro-industrial complex.

At 1912 GMT Shalayev begins to speak. He outlines the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions position with regard to Ryzhkov's report. Improving the economy will depend on much, including how well people work. He said they are not overoptimistic or overpessimistic over prospects. He advocates that the Supreme Soviet debate and adopt a number of important economic draft laws as early as late January or early February next year. He stresses the importance of workers' training. It is necessary to improve working conditions. The AUCCTU is convinced that socioeconomic policy in the USSR needs a sharp turn toward making working conditions more humane. The trade unions are categorically against any claims that unemployment is necessary to improve the economy. They support moves toward reforming pricing policy and reforming wholesale and purchase prices. They urge caution however in the approach to reforming retail prices. In view of the complexity of the present economic situation the trade unions support the Council of Minsters' program for improving the situation.

At 1925 GMT Shalayev supports the call to Gorbachev and Bush to end nuclear weapons tests at Semipalatinsk and Nevada.

1928 GMT

LD1512202689

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 1928 GMT Deputy Kukhar speaks of the need for radical and comprehensive measures to improve economic conditions in the countryside. He supports the view in Ryzhkov's report that attention must be paid to the opinions of farmers on the spot. The present system is blamed for the shortage of foodstuffs, but the real reason for the shortage is the insufficient attention paid to agriculture. Emphasis is being put on increasing assistance for weak farms. Supplies to farms of equipment, spare parts, and fuel are not satisfactory. While some wholesale prices for industrial output have been increased, the reform of purchase prices for agricultural produce is not to take place till 1991. The farms need to be compensated. There have been improvements in farm working in some regions of the country, but there has been no major improvement as a whole. The countryside needs help from the towns in its construction plans. Cooperative funds can be used to improve supplies of building materials for the countryside. Agricultural workers need better support from the mass media.

At 1941 GMT Deputy Ryzhkov takes the floor. He speaks of the need for professionalism. Half-knowledge is worse than ignorance. He stresses the importance of qualifications. He stresses the importance of morality and intellect in any society's achievements. The state needs to fund the important educational and scientific spheres. No society acts only on a commercial basis. He mentions the advantages of ration cards in the fair distribution of foodstuffs. He notes that the salary of functionaries in the apparatus and that of teachers has not risen for many, many years. He decries the general attitude toward education at the congress. He warns against the danger of stereotype thinking and of levelling attitudes. He says that rationing and the market are not incompatible.

At 1958 GMT Dekputy Pallayev says that the measures outlined by the government for 1990 will not lead to a real turnaround in the economy. In a federal state attention should be paid to the needs of all republics. However, Tajikistan is lagging behind in certain respects. There are restrictions on Tajikistan's cotton-growing, which is a reason for the republic lagging behind. He speaks of the need for a statewide program. Regional financial autonomy is not suitable everywhere. Various government decisions, including the one of the Aral Sea, do not sufficiently take account of Tajakistan's interests. He considers that the new 5-year plan should leave maximum room for maneuvering by the union republics. Genuine financial autonomy remains an unrealizable dream without cardinal reform of pricing. Sufficient resources have not been provided for increased consumer goods production.

At 2010 GMT Deputy Polyanskaya from Tynda on the Baykal-Amur Railway decries the reduction in state funds for construction of housing. She warns against speculators in foodstuffs. She praises the BAM project, but says there is now a threat of unemployment in the BAM zone. She refers to a request to the Finance Ministry for more funds for BAM. The response shows that perestroyka is only proceeding slowly inside that ministry among its bureaucrats.

At 2018 GMT a break is announced.

2019 GMT

LD1512210389

[Editorial Report] At 2019 GMT on 15 December, Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2019 GMT Niyazov agrees with former speakers that a lot depends on the correct system of taxation. He argues that agricultural credits have to be improved. He recognizes the importance of a special union investment fund and argues for republican ones as well. He advocates no state ownership in everyday consumer services, arguing for leasing and other systems. According to most indices, the standard of living in Turkmenistan lags behind that of the union as a whole. He says that regional financial autonomy demands considerable funds from the center. He asks for compensation and economic support.

Niyazov argues for equal exchange of goods between the union republics, leaving the republics with the right to determine what is imported and exported. Also the republics themselves should be able to decide what to do with surplus production, including selling it abroad. The bell rings. In Turkmenistan 30,000 gas workers provide 12 percent of Soviet gas. The bell rings a third time. Niyazov talks about the need for correct political relations. The bell rings for the fourth time.

At 2036 GMT the chairwoman warns deputies to be brief in their speeches.

At 2036 GMT Belov says that pension provision has been fixed for emigres. Belov comments that many Soviet workers will not live to pensionable age. He wants to know why Abalkin is so keen on Western technology, when the Soviet Union has its own. He says that man cannot live by bread alone. He says that patriots cannot be slaves and is applauded. Together with agricultural reform, state farms and collective farms should be strengthened and encouraged.

Belov castigates the goverment for discontinuing its anti-alcoholism campaign of 1985 and the revenue it makes out of human misery. He says that the delegations packing Aeroflot planes to fly to the West are spending hard currency, while the government complains that it has none.

He calls for the old Russian names to be returned to squares and streets. He complains that the Tretyakov Gallery and the Bolshoi theater are closed, but pornography is sweeping Soviet cities in the name of democracy. Belov complains about the death of forests. He asks for the way the budget is formed to be published. He says that the peasants who were repressed from the twenties to the forties should be rehabilitated. He repeats his demand that the old Russian names be returned to streets and squares.

2052 GMT

LD1512220589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the 15 December Session of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies from the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2052 GMT Bronshteyn states that it is impossible to switch from one economic state to another at once. He says that the government should be given an opportunity to realize its economic program, but that does not mean that deputies should agree with every point of this program. Bronshteyn manages to agree with all shades of opinion in the economic debate, from Popov to Ligachev. The government is printing more money to get out of its problems and this is emptying the market. Since we have no resources, we should be given freedom, and this will become a resource, says Bronshteyn. This must be a gradual process.

Bronshteyn says yesterday he spoke to Abalkin personally. They compared 1989 with 1927. There was a good harvest but nothing was delivered. In 1927 compulsion was used. This year it was not. This freedom is a resource in agriculture, but it is necessary to know how to use it. He says that we should not argue who owes whom what, e.g. Russia owes Estonia, or Estonia owes Russia, and so forth. He calls for restraint from republics in asking for economic support and is heckled. The bell rings. He asks deputies not to think of him as an enemy of the people. The bell rings again and again.

At 2108 GMT Gorbachev says that many deputies are unhappy because of the lack of chance to discuss things. He suggests concluding discussion of the report by 1600 on 16 December and then spend 3 hours discussing changes to the Constitution. He says we can sit until 2000. He says that Sunday is a day off. He suggests on 18 December discussing the Constitution from 1000. In the afternoon they will say goodbye to Sakharov and work in session from 1600. On 19 December they will continue working to schedule.

At 2112 GMT the chairwoman gives out various administrative instructions on where various deputies should meet after the sitting.

At 2113 GMT the chairman of the secretariat, Kryuchkov takes the floor to say that some of the deputies may not have been using the electronic voting equipment properly. Twelve deputies have revealed that they pressed the wrong button by mistake, which led to a distorted result. The chairman says that such hiccups will not have affected the results of ballots. Five deputies have been voting without the authority of the congress. Whether or not their votes will count will be put to the congress. Because of these aberrations, the chairman makes some corrections to a congress bulletin. Also, some deputies are not registering themselves. He gives an example of this. He castigates the deputies for absenteeism. There have been cases of one deputy voting for another. In the future the cards of absent deputies will be automatically blocked. The machine has shown that some deputies are not treating it with sufficient respect during voting.

There are questions from the floor for the chairman. A deputy suggests that there be a roll call each day to shame those deputeis who are absent. Another deputy says that Medvedev cannot be chairman of the editorial commission. Gorbachev answers that the majority of present deputies voted for medvedev, although this is not a majority of all deputies, as is strictly necessary. Deputy Logunov pleads from the floor, brandishing 4,000 signatures, for revoting on Article 6.

At 2127 GMT voting takes place to approve what the chairman of the secretariat has said: 1,549 for; 160 against; and 18 abstentions, and the chairwoman announces therefore Logunov's proposal is removed.

At 2130, GMT there is a vote on the agenda put forward by Gorbachev to continue debates for tomorrow: 1,227 for; 444 against; and 29 abstentions. At 2133 GMT the session ends.

The announcer says there will be a broadcast on the congress tomorrow at 1600 GMT.

Deputies Speak at 15 Dec Session

Khabarovsk's Danilyuk

LD1512213389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1519 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Remarks by Nikolayevich Danilyuk, chairman of the Khabarovsk Kray Executive Committee, at the 15 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] Any state system must be governed. What is more, the country needs a strong hand for the implementation of the political and economic reform, but not a hand that would take reprisals against the people. You and I have already endured that. Looking toward capitalism, we are carried away by the big-time democracy. Yes, there they criticize; Yes, there they collectively work out decisions. However, look at the statutes of any concern or firm. They are based on tough discipline, order, and good organization. Tell me, what state would allow mass disorders in transport, would deliberately agree to a worsening of the energy crisis, organize an irrepressible inflation process, would permit the flouting of the law and state discipline, mass strikes, and would destroy the system of supplying materials and equipment. At the same time we say that we have achieved unprecedented democracy and glasnost.

If we ask the question: In what way? In that we have publicly started defending criminals; often whipping up interethnic dissension; are supplanting homegrown culture; are forfeiting any respect for our homeland; having forgotten such concepts as charity and humanity? even more than was the case in the times of stagnation, we have started promising social benefits to the people, but without having the wherewithal. To these and other questions I did not receive a reply in Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report. Not having received a reply, I ask myself, what real foundations are there for the fulfillment of the program proposed? In this connection one gets an impression which reminds one of the bad master who destroyed his bad home, and having found himself without a roof over his head, has started thinking how to build a new home. What worries us is that the concepts, stages, and approaches which are being proposed do not remove the immediate and long-term problems of the Far East, in particular of Khabarovsk Kray.

The distinctive feature of our conditions is such that the nationalization of production and of the whole of social life here has a far deeper history and firmer foundations. Transport, the mining industry, defense—these are the key state sectors, and they remain the leading ones for Khabarovsk Kray. [passage omitted]

Latvia's Gorbunov Urges Decentralization

LD1512210789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1546 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Speech by Anatoliy Valerianovich Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the 15 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] Esteemed chairman, esteemed colleague deputies.

Reforms need a legal basis. In my view, the most valuable thing that we have acquired during this incomplete year in our legislative activity are certain qualitatively new steps on the path toward bringing the positions of the republics and the union government closer together. For us, it was the fact that the USSR Council of Ministers appreciated the creative quest of the Baltic republics and enabled the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt the law on economic independence for Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. Thanks to all who supported us

Today we are experiencing both satisfaction and very great trepidation. Trepidation, not only at responsibility—this is natural—but also at that atmosphere in which we have attempted to take the first steps on the road to decentralization. We have been seriously rebuked and told that it is only possible to transfer to economic independence in the country when the whole republic becomes mature enough for this, only when the standard of living is made even, i.e. when identical launch conditions in all republics and so forth are achieved.

But comrades, do we really have to wait while everyone simultaneously becomes in some way mature enough, while everyone everywhere becomes identical and standardized. This means not only lagging behind but also letting social development drift in this or that region.

I don't know about my colleague deputies in the Supreme Soviet, but so far I am not satisfied with my legislative activity in the USSR Supreme Soviet. The very methodology is being created excruciatingly slowly. [passage omitted]

I want to touch on an issue in which we have not not moved a single step forward. This is the issue of the conception of the fundamentally new, democratic bases of our federation. What ruined Lenin's scheme of federation?

In our view the main reason is too much centralization. How should we extract ourselves from the crisis today?

In Latvia, I will even dare to say in the Baltic, there are two approaches. The first: The inefficient functioning of the center in recent decades and a certain disillusionment with the results of the work of the first congress on legal settlement of the independence of the republics in one part of the population, especially the indigenous population, have strengthened the idea that the only future path is secession from the union.

The second approach is that it would be possible to get out of the crisis at the price of decentralization and strict delimitation of the functions of the union and republics in favor of the latter. The union will consolidate and develop itself on the basis of mutually advantageous contractual, economic, and other links, realizing joint programs and projects.

Let us not rush to stigmatize the first point of view. All the more so, this should not be done by those who have a distorted or superficial idea of the life of the Latvian republic of the 1920's and 1930's when Latvia was an independent state and which was forcibly interrupted. We still do not have a frank assessment of the present state of the Soviet federation from the point of view of equality of rights of the peoples, including the conditions under which each republic entered the union.

It seems to us that, at present, it is much more important to undertake active steps to fill the status of the union republics with real sovereignty. Sharp responses addressed at the republics consolidate and multipy only centrifugal forces. In this situation we should act energetically and constructively, not linking ourselves to outdated approaches and laws.

We propose consolidating, reinforcing in the interim period that precedent which has arisen in the work of the Supreme Soviet. That is, between congresses, the laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet are in force to realize necessary reforms, even if they are at variance with the old Constitution. As a result, the congress establishes the necessary amendments to the Constitution.

Why then can not the Supreme Soviets of the republics act in the same way? After all it is impossible to deny the right of union republics too in this respect.

Until there is a redistribution of the state powers of the union and the republics, we cannot remain forever in the role of petitioners, even on matters that are purely the concern of the Latvian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR]. After all, our individual voices are simply lost in the vast chorus of deputies from other republics that are many times greater than Latvia in terms of the size of their territory and their population.

We have therefore been forced to defend the interests of the republic via the will of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR, laying down the procedures in respect of the entry into the republic's territory of union laws, if they are adopted without account being taken of the republic's interests. I agree that this is not the best legal model for a federation, but to remove the reasons for employing such a practice the USSR Supreme Soviet with the participation of the republics needs to clearly define the issues on which USSR laws are adopted with the consent of all the republics, that is, by consensus and those issues on which they are adopted only with the consent of those republics that are directly affected. This is the unshakable position of the Supreme Soviet of the Latvian SSR. Thus it is not without contradictions that we shall move toward the principle of the supremacy of union laws in federative relations and of republican laws inside a republic.

The criticism is unjustified that the Supreme Soviet and government of the Latvian Supreme Soviet are fully responsible for their decisions to all the republic's citizens irrespective of their nationality and their term of residence. Obviously there will always be contradictions, but we should not cause antagonisms and aggressiveness by our decisions. We are responsible in that regard. However, the main role in solving this problem must be played not by diktat and condemnation from the center but by the civic positions of deputies of the republic's Supreme Soviet and the responsibility felt by each citizen for the destiny of the republic. Criticism on the part of any group of citizens of the republic is not only permissible but indeed apt. In the work of the republic's Supreme Soviet we shall take into account and do take into account the views of all groups of the population, since without this, particularly with the new composition of soviets, one will simply not be able to ensure political stability, and what kind of perestroyka can there be without political stability?

The fact that union interests are closely interwoven with republican interests is utterly clear to all of us. Therefore we should not brush aside what would seem a purely union issue—the issue of the army. matters relating to defense are indeed all-union matters, but we are all responsible for how we should construct our army and how we should interact so that the army is always at one with the people. As for the USSR Supreme Soviet it seems to me that we, together with our military deputy colleagues, have been attempting to operate precisely on the principle that the people and the army are united. Indeed, we were, I think, brought up that way. I recall, for instance, with warmth my fellow regiment members from Siberia, Uzbekistan, Ukraine, Lithuania, and Estonia.

I regret particular instances of disrespect for the army that have taken place in Latvia. To avert such manifestations we need not only to appraise them but also to remove certain reasons for them. The Latvian Supreme Soviet set up a special commission which is studying the questions of conscripts and military service by Latvia's citizens. After listening to the results of the commission, the Supreme Soviet discussed a host of suggestions by the republic's inhabitants and came to the conclusion that in the situation that has come about in Latvia there is now a very acute need to introduce the institution of alternative types of service in line with the corresponding world practice. The Latvian Supreme Soviet is submitting its proposals and asking the USSR Supreme Soviet to consider this matter and to adopt a law on alternative service prior to the 1990 spring conscription.

In discussions with military comrades there is particular nonacceptance of the idea of national territorial formations in the Soviet Army. This is regarded as the separation of the army according to their national quarters. I do not deny the importance of such an argument, but I find it difficult to explain, for instance, to my own son why his great grandfather fought with honor within the regiments of the Red Latvian Riflemen during the Civil War and his grandfather in the 43d Latvian Guards Division in the Great Patriotic War, which traversed a path from Narofominsk to Kurland, while he himself cannot serve in a Latvian guards division. Ruling out even the possibility of debate, military comrades reject the possibility in the present situation of reviving certain glorious traditions of the Red Army. [passage omitted]

Komi's Filippov on Miners' Motives

LD1512211489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1600 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Speech by Viktor Pavlovich Filippov, deputy from the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, at the 15 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpts] [Passage omitted] The workers in the mining industry are in a difficult position. The country learned in more depth about the problems of the miners of the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] only when the miners of Vorkuta and Inta were obliged to stop work and declare a strike. The miners have asked me to convey to the congress that the mass media is often very unobjective in reflecting their demands, distorting them and accusing miners of group egotism. This is far from true. Today the miners are prepared to postpone the government decisions made for their benefit until a later date provided that they are applied to all inhabitants of their northern region. Group egotism has never been a characteristic of the working class. [passage omitted]

Our electors asked us to call the congress's attention to the matter of abolishing the nuclear testing ground on Novaya Zemlya. It is all happening as described by Mikhail Vasilyevich Lomonosov. Excuse me for an imprecise quotation. If something disappears to some extent from one place it just reappears to the same extent in another. As things disappear from Semipalatinsk they seem to come up on Novaya Zemlya to the same extent. I call on the congress to support our demand. This is a matter of the life and health of many millions of people in the north of our Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic. Thank you for your attention.

Moldavia's Snegur

PM1612203089 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 3-4

[Speech by M.I. Snegur, deputy for Sorokskiy Territorial Electoral Okrug, Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic (SSR) (chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium), at 15 December morning session of Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies]

[Text] Esteemed comrades! The government report on improving the economy that has been submitted for discussion contains, in our view, a fairly comprehensive assessment of the actual state of affairs in the national economy and concrete ways of overcoming the crisis.

The switch to a shorter time scale for the attainment of objectives merits approval, since it makes those objectives more concrete and boosts people's confidence, which has often been lost because of the widespread practice whereby impressive plans were formulated for the long term, but promises were never entirely fulfilled.

Another important feature that should be noted in the fundamental approaches that have been submitted for the formulation of the draft 13th 5-Year Plan is the inclusion of multiple options. I think this will enable us to make a more considered choice of ways of resolving such complex tasks as the strengthening of the economy's social orientation coupled with the simultaneous boosting of its efficiency. This approach is worthy of imitation locally. Therefore we in our republic, in drawing up the plan for the next 5-year period, also intend to examine several options, without prejudging the question of which of them will be given preference (especially given that, in the light of local conditions, there could be more than three of them). Here the main thing is to increase the population's real income and fill it with new content.

In this connection the report does not appear to devote sufficient attention to the union republics' forthcoming switch to self-management and self-financing. Yet it was the lack of sufficient economic rights and opportunities for the republics that was the cause of the situation that now has to be rectified. We tried for long enough the various methods of improving and ameliorating matters, and not one of them produced the necessary results. Real economic sovereignty is the most effective means of normalizing the economy and endowing it with dynamism in the republics and therefore in the country as a whole. In the conditions of the unionwide economic imbalance and the budget deficit, it is in the territories that the success of economic reform must be ensured—in the union and autonomous republics, krays and oblasts, cities, and rayons. That is, where the basic production components interact: the population, the material and technical base, the infrastructure, and the natural environment. It would be logical, within the framework of the package of measures under discussion, to formulate statewide principles for a new regional policy, with a view to defining the objectives of the USSR's regional socioeconomic development and the most important interrepublican problems, strengthening the social thrust of the territories' development, including ecological safety, forming an economic self-management mechanism, developing a regional and scientific and technical strategy, and boosting the role of the soviets as the real instruments of territorial policy.

In speaking of this I have in mind first and foremost, of course, the specific features of our Moldavian SSR. Nothing is further from my mind than any kind of isolation, because the republic is linked by thousands of threads to the country's entire national economic complex. But at the same time true economic sovereignty should mean first and foremost the management of the entire economy on the republic's territory by its own organs of management and the local soviets.

This will provide an opportunity to end the longstanding practice of the voluntarist approach to the siting of production forces (an approach which has nothing in common with the specific characteristics of the republic's economic complex), the siting of enterprises for whose operation the republic has neither the raw materials, nor the markets, nor the trained cadres. Let me note that this came about in the conditions of the USSR's biggest shortage of water resources, the permanent removal of vast areas of the highly productive Moldavian Chernozem from circulation, and the sharp deterioration of the ecological situation. In this connection we consider justified the economic sanctions proposed in the report on new construction in the production sphere.

The normalization of the economy of the republic and the country entails the need to regulate migratory processes. We are witnessing a paradoxical situation whereby, in the conditions of a planned economy, migration is taking place from regions where there is a manpower shortage to regions where there is a manpower surplus.

The siting of new enterprises was not accompanied by the training of cadres from among the local inhabitants, and that led to the unjustified practice of inviting workers in from other regions and granting them housing and other social benefits on privileged terms. The former USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, for instance, at the time of the construction of the Moldavian Metallurgical Plant in Rybnitsa, planned to invite in 139 specialists, who naturally did not exist in our republic of orchards and vineyards. In fact, more than 900 people were invited in, many of whom had had nothing to do with metallurgy in the past. In this way the housing stock was squandered, which prompted a keenly negative reaction among the inhabitants of the city and the republic's working people. Strict proceedings were taken against the city soviet leaders.

Such phenomena have an adverse effect in particular on the satisfaction of the needs of the republic's urban population, which has one of the worst indicators for the provision of social benefits. This is also true of the capital—the city of Kishinev, where the annual population growth in the last 10 years was the highest of all the union republican capitals, amounting to 3 percent. Naturally, no infrastructure can keep up with that situation. This disruption, along with local errors, led to unemployment for a section of the population, to a new phenomenon for the republic—strikes, and to other disruptions of the rhythm of the economy's operation, and this, most regrettably, largely predetermined the exacerbation of interethnic relations. Economic sovereignty in this respect means the preliminary training of specialists for future projects and spheres of activity and the expansion of ties, especially in the sphere of production, scientific, technical, financial, credit, and other cooperation. Naturally, the republic should have full rights as regards the regulation of such cooperation.

At the same time the proposed measures seem to express misgivings about autonomous relationships between the republics and other countries. Centralized licensing, quotas on goods, and the use of sanctions are proposed, which will hardly prove efficient for the country, the republic, or the economic system. The same applies to the opportunities for earning and using foreign currency resources. And lastly, the principles of autonomy should be extended to the system of national economic and budgetary planning. In our view the adoption of the country's state plan and budget should be preceded by work in the union republics (in contrast to the way it is done now)—the country's interests would be made up of the interests of the republics. Especially since when the plans are being formulated in the republic, the relevant guidelines for the USSR's long-term development, the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress, concepts, various special-purpose directives, and so forth are already known. In the conditions of the current radical and dynamic socioeconomic changes we are, of course, inadequately trained as legislators. But all the same, we should speed up the formulation of the laws on ownership, citizenship, entry and exit, land, and so forth, the lack of which will adversely affect the results of the functioning of the regional economy.

Now a few concrete proposals for short-term emergency measures to normalize the economy over the next 3 years. I would put in first place measures to combat losses, not only by means of improving the infrastructure, but also by improving the standard of discipline and order. It is here, in my view, that we need both sanctions and accountability. These should be tougher; the sense of responsibility to the people, the party, and the state should be boosted at all levels.

What use are we, if we have not even learned to store the grain we grow? We waste millions of tonnes, roughly the same amount as we import for currency. And how much meat is wasted? Merely by eliminating these losses we could bring the average annual per capita consumption of this valuable product more than 3 kg closer to the scientifically substantiated norms. I think all the people's deputies, together with their voters, should everywhere concentrate attention on the elimination of losses.

Measures are needed to immobilize and tie up the surplus money, not backed up by goods, that is in the possession of the population, enterprises, and organizations, so as to lessen the pressure on the consumer market. Apart from the measures proposed in the report, it would be possible to offer for sale to the population all kinds of unutilized waste products and secondary resources, even at giveaway prices.

We should also heed the working people's proposals for transferring to the population's ownership the state housing stock apartments which they occupy, making them responsible at the same time for the full payment of running costs. That would remove a huge burden from the state budget and improve the maintenance of the housing stock, which is now in a lamentable condition.

This list of measures also includes the holding of auctions to sell the property of loss-making or low-profit economic units, if they cannot be sold as a whole; and the sale by enterprises and organizations, along with finished products, of a proportion of types of raw and semifinished materials that are in very short supply, at commercial prices.

As an emergency measure it appears expedient to adopt a decision of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies pronouncing all strikes impermissible in 1990, or better still, 1990-1992. And in general it must be said that strikes are the most unacceptable means of resolving problems. The Moldavian people, including my voters, condemn strikes. The call by a group of prestigious people's deputies for a warning strike is regrettable. Evidently they simply do not know that it is more difficult to emerge from a strike than not to start it. We have seen that for ourselves.

And another question of exceptional importance. It is a great pity that it does not appear possible to carry out a reform of wholesale and purchasing prices for agricultural produce in 1990. This is a great omission which will prevent enterprises from formulating a more logical plan for the 5-year period on the basis of new priorities set by the new prices. Everything possible must be done to ensure that a system of prices in the national economy, including retail prices, is formulated in 1990, submitted for wide discussion, and introduced in January 1991.

Coming back to measures to improve food supplies to the population, and on the whole welcoming them, I should, however, note that here too we find certain sanctions in the event of the nonfulfillment of deliveries according to a centralized allocation. One hopes that this allocation will accord with the principle of social justice.

I wish to support the agrarian deputies and express my own conviction, as a peasant, that our agro-industrial complex is capable of feeding the country. All that is necessary is for all of us to turn our attention to the countryside in practice, not "theoretically." The potential is inexhaustible, as is indicated, for instance, by some of the current year's results in certain sectors of our republic's agriculture.

I wish to report to the Congress the fruitful work of science-and-production systems. The science-and-production system for corn, for instance, incorporates some 1,400 farms, of which more than 1,000 are outside the republic—virtually from our northwestern borders to Kurgan Oblast and Kazakhstan. These are the threads of integration, the contractual basis, which I spoke of earlier.

I will take it upon myself to declare that this system is highly efficient. I think my colleagues from various regions of the country will support me. Here is just one example. Some 170,000 tonnes of seed of Moldavian hybrids have been grown, including something like 130,000 tonnes of early-maturing hybrids. In total, our hybrids will cover more than 5 million hectares next year. That means that the scientific potential of the agrarian sector is capable of a great deal, without, I repeat, bureaucratic administration. People find one another. Autonomy and the contract—that is the basis of fruitful relationships in the agro-industrial complex and elsewhere. Peasants know how to work. Let us give the countryside the necessary resources, and I am confident that the stores will fill up with food.

In principle we approve the provisions of the government report, and at the same time we consider it necessary to amend the final version of the package of measures in the light of the proposals put forward. Thank you for your attention.

Armenian Secretary Arutyunyan

NC1712164589 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0545 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Yesterday the deputies continued to exchange views at the Congress of the USSR People's Deputies concerning the report submitted by the Soviet Government on the revival of the country's economy. Suren Arutyunyan, USSR people's deputy and first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, also addressed the meeting.

The paper published Comrade Arutyunyan's speech. He said: Our congress has gathered at an (?unprecedented) complex and evidently dramatic time for the fate of the country's restructuring. The people have been waiting a long time for decisions that would finally provide solutions to the extremely acute social, economic, and interethnic problems, and to complex problems shaping socialism on qualitatively new foundations. Which path shall we (?chose)? Which alternative for the development of the country shall we apply? And what new facet will our congress give to the reneval effort? The success of renewal will depend on the answers to these questions.

Referring to the complex problems facing our republic, Comrade Arutyunyan said: The creation of the necessary conditions and guarantees is an objective necessity for the transition into a complex economic management system. And that is not a mere necessity for our republic; rather, it is a critical and vital requirement. That is why we propose so resolutely the introduction of principles of free enterprise and the creation of more conducive conditions for the long-term attraction of foreign capital.

Still, there are enormous difficulties in creating joint enterprises, and creating and using foreign currency resources. The formulation of a new organizational and legal mechanism and diplomatic guarantees compatible with the requirements of the reforms in foreign economic ties are being delayed.

Unfortunately, the situation in our region remains extremely tense and explosive and fraught with dangers. The situation was further exacerbated after the adoption of the decision on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast by the USSR Supreme Soviet on 28 November of this year. Mikhail Gorbachev said at the congress that that decision was not accepted by any of the sides. Our republic's Supreme Soviet unanimously considered the adopted decision as incongruous with the prevailing situation and as unacceptable.

Yeltsin Calls for Dismantling Central Control

LD1512222889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1729 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Speech by Deputy Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Committee for Construction and Architecture of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at the 15 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Comrade Deputies! I do not agree with the assertion of several speakers at the latest Central Committee plenum and here at the Congress that we are taking the wrong road. No, this is not what Comrade Gorbachev, the Politburo, and the government are guilty of. The road is the right one, the socialist one, the way to renew our society. The thing is we are moving along it in the wrong way, we are moving blindly, we are marking time. Our leaders themselves had a poor idea of the ditches and the obstacles along this road and society gave no warning of them. The guilt of the initiators of perestroyka is that perestroyka was announced as yet another slogan, without carefully worked out tactics for its implementation. And specific proposals of a tactical nature were proposed to the leadership 3 years ago, but they were deemed to be politically mistaken and premature, and nothing was done. What we have now is something else: Half-measures, indecisiveness, compromises, and balancing between the interests of the apparatus and society have brought us to a lost 5-Year Plan period and all-around crisis.

The danger at the present moment lies in the fact that the people are losing trust while we constantly repeat that perestroyka has embraced everyone, that it is spreading deeper and wider. In my view this is simply hypocrisy. The time has come to give society an objective picture of the situation and that is what should have been done by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who declared perestroyka and who is of course involved in today's crisis of it. This was proposed, but it was not included in the agenda of the congress.

Now about the government's report. Despite a number of new and attractive measures set out in it, the Congress of People's Deputies cannot adopt it as a directive document. It is essential that we define the principles of the economic reform and on the basis of these instruct the government, with due consideration for the proposals of the deputies, the economists, and production people with a high intellectual input to work out the only true option in today's situation.

The report speaks of the exacerbation of the problems and the symptoms of the economic crisis are named. But there is no analysis of the causes which have led to it. Having named and admitted our mistakes we would develop openly an analysis of the ways of getting out of the crisis. The title itself of the report "On Measures to Improve..." tediously brings to mind "measures to improve", "radical improvements" and so on and so forth and other old masterpieces of the apparatus which were adopted in their hundreds with the efficiency of a steam-locomotive. Furthermore this is already the fifth attempt to reform the country's economy in 3 decades. Remember the reforms of 1956, 1966, 1979, and 1983. What did they lead to? Our fifth attempt has been getting nowhere for 5 years now.

What is the deep-seated reason for such dispiriting monotony? Where is the guarantee that the present attempt, too, will not come to a sorry end? No such approach to the analysis in the report of the government is to be seen. I would just like to remind you that evidently you and I will not have the opportunity to carry out a sixth attempt to improve both the economy and society.

Take the example of Eastern Europe. If 2 months ago Erich Honecker had been asked how much time was needed for the implementation of the process of democratization in the party and in the country, he would have asked, perhaps, for about 5 years. But a wave of popular demonstration swept the country and these problems were resolved in the course of a matter of weeks, including the abolition of Article 6. True, this was already without Honecker.

And so, Mikhail Sergeyevich, were such universal processes to begin in our country we are confident that they would take place within the same civilized European framework as was the case in the GDR and in Czechoslovakia. In the absence of political guarantees of tomorow's democratization, when the shops are empty and when there is semiglasnost, there is no such confidence. The government did not manage to curb inflation. The state printing press is working twice as quickly as it did during the period of stagnation. The government's decision to raise the pay of those working for the state and party apparatus will force it to increase its speed even more. And all of this is against a background of falling standards of living for the absolute majority of the population—which does not have power—against a background of an unprecedented impoverishment of the market in goods.

Why are all those who enjoy privileges and benefits unable to renounce them themselves but are awaiting the decision of the commission, which, judging by the speed of its work, might wait for the privileges to be expropriated from below, then without any commission?

Overall the government's proposals can be summarized as follows: to stop; on some things even take a step backwards; pause for breath; and build up one's strength for the next stage. But this is not simply stopping, it is throwing perestroyka back. Will there be a next stage after this? Will those conservative forces which have set themselves the task of preventing the transfer of the economic reform onto the plane of radical transformations permit the next stage to be started and gone through by democratic means? They have consolidated themselves and have fulfilled their task for the present time.

I am convinced that economic reform is in immediate need of the support of the congress and the people.

The creation of a multistructural economy is the cornerstone of economic reform. But what does the government propose in this sphere? That the administrative-command system should grow gradually into a market economy. Isn't it clear that this hybrid will not be viable? It's about time that a clear stance was adopted which is understandable to all. Everything which makes it possible to feed the country and to create an abundance of nonfood goods and which makes it possible to make the life of the Soviet man spiritually rich is expedient. He is worn out to the utmost by our economic disorders. He needs results. And it is simply naive to count upon ideas, slogans, and appeals.

Can one really agree with the time scale? Six years. That is the government's estimate. This means that for a minimum of 6 years our economy will not be giving a real return and will not be giving the person an improvement in his life. This year has shown that a combination of administrative-command and market principles in the economy produces a negative results.

The question should be put like this. After the adoption of a package of economic laws the labor collectives should decide independently the question of the expediency of their transfer to the new conditions of economic management, without any orders from above. One does not become an owner by decree from above. Land must be given back to the peasants. And let the peasant himself decide how to manage it—collective or state farms, private farms, and individual holdings. And that's the only way it should be. But they are holding back the law on the land, understanding that the land question is a question of power. It's time to say clearly that its de-ideologization is a condition of the reanimation of the economy and the reform.

Distorted forms of economic links have given rise to their twin in politics, too. By not putting forward concrete measures for the complete dismantling of the command and bureaucratic apparatus of power, we will fail to change radically the totalitarian regime built on hypocrisy, lies, and mistrust. The government is practically preserving the logic that operated previously of directive, centralized planning. And this gradually pushes the leadership of enterprises to this kind of decision—one ought not to struggle for independence, for the old system is more reliable and less responsible. Therefore I think that one of the underwater rocks upon which the economic reform might run aground still remains the virtually unresolved problem of the social protection for the person. He is without rights because he is opposed by monopolism in all areas of life support—the authorities, the party, state property, trade, everyday services, municipal undertakings, access to the press and so on and so forth. It is time to start setting up alternative structures in this sphere, state, cooperative and private structures, structures based on the collective ownership of the means of production and others.

Taking all this into account, it makes sense for the second congress, in its decision, not to approve the government's measures but to formulate only the main principles of the new system of economic relations. We should precisely define that the main thing now in this dangerous, crucial moment, is to assign things for 1990 precisely month by month. It will decide everything. We shall still be able to debate the long term, but the government should be guided by these principles.

I think it would be right if the decision of the congress were to give some instructions to the party, too. This would make it possible to register the historic choice made by the peoples of our country at the present stage. It is important to create the political conditions in which the people in general believe that the new conditions of economic management are this time serious and meant to last, that the new producer, the collective, cooperative or individual producer, is also guaranteed against changes in the political state of affairs bringing in their wake another dispossession of the kulaks. And, finally, a specific plan is needed for dismantling the main levers of the administrative economy and a consistency of measures. I am not going to talk about those which have already been proposed by members of the interregional deputies' group. First, the abolition of industrial monopolist ministries, the radical transformation of the State Planning Committee, price reform, the reorganization of the credit and finance system, in particular the withdrawal of the USSR State Bank from the composition of the Council of Ministers, the setting up of an issuing and reserve bank subordinated to the Supreme Soviet, the setting up of a labor exchange, stock and commodity exchanges, monetary reform and the exchange of money. I think that the plan for the 5-year period is out of date and it is necessary to go over to planning for 1 or 2 years and the formation of long-term state programs for priority areas. And the main thing, alongside social issues, is a program on information science and the computerization of the country.

It is necessary to open up by legislative means a broader front for foreign investment, to build and sell housing, and so on. Economic independence must be given to all union autonomous formations, anti-monopoly laws and a law on a fundamentally new investment policy in the country must be adopted. Before there is a new consitution, amendments must be adopted on the fundamental issues of the country's life which would not hinder the adoption of new laws, which was not put onto the agenda. A law must be adopted on public and political organizations and the possibility of a transition to a multiparty system. A law must be adopted on referenda in place of the clandestine and as always vague nationwide discussion. Reforms are needed in the Army, the Ministry of Internal Affairs and the KGB. The diktat of the party in the elections of republican and local soviets should be excluded. I consider it expedient for a session of the Supreme Soviet, probably an extraordinary session, to be held in January, and for a package of economic laws and laws on the press and the place of self-management to be adopted at it, thereby giving scope for the creative will of the people in 1990 already.

The main thing at the present time is to determine precisely one's choice, to give the people prospects, to take resolute steps in the direction of that choice and move on without having to get going and without hesitating, because we no longer have any time for hesitating or getting going. Thank you. [applause]

Abalkin Blasts Yeltsin Economic Reform Proposal

LD1512153589 Moscow TASS in English 1429 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Deputy Premier and Academician Leonid Abalkin expressed complete disagreement with the economic reform proposals advanced by Deputy Boris Yeltsin at today's morning session of the Soviet Congress of People's Deputies.

At a news conference in the Kremlin today, Abalkin told TASS that the Yeltsin-suggested economic reform measures are "untenable, utterly unacceptable and dangerous from the socio-political point of view."

These measures have utilised proposals from the most diverse circles, including the government, Abalkin said. But in so doing Yeltsin tries to combine incompatible economic ideas.

The Soviet government-suggested programme, which the Second Congress of People's Deputies is now considering, is the product of realism and renunciation of cavalry-charge-type methods of perestroika in favour of a stage-by-stage process of carrying out economic reform, Abalkin said.

"Both as a scientist and politician I am dissatisfied by many things in the economic stabilisation programme that we have suggested and primarily by the insufficient theoretical elaboration of the concept of a transitional period from the administrative model of socialist to a market-oriented one," Abalkin said.

"But in the established conditions, this programme is the only way to stabilise the economy and prepare it for the introduction of market levers," he pointed out.

Likening perestroika to a new revolution and expecting the speediest results from it, society in many respects proceeded from the ideological myth that revolution is a certain on-off act, Abalkin observed.

But it will take years and possibly the life spans of whole generations for genuinely profound transformations to come about, he added.

For example, in a transition to a market economy, it will take at least three years of intense work to create the necessary infrastructure, including stock and commodity exchanges, a new taxation system, the adoption of social guarantees for the population, the ensurance of the convertibility of the rouble, the adoption of anti-monopoly legislation and many other things, Abalkin said.

Warns Struggle Inevitable

LD1512204689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As always during the long break, the latest briefing was held at the congress press center. Today, replies to journalists' questions were first given by Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and one of the authors of the economic reform proposed by the government. There were many questions on the whole program, of course, but perhaps the majority of those at the news conference would have seconded this question, which was put by TASS correspondent Orlov.

[Begin recording] [Orlov] Do you entertain the idea that your program may not be adopted by the congress? And if so, can the program proposed today by Yeltsin as an alternative program be considered, or at least a part of it?

[Abalkin] There will inevitably be a struggle. Various options are possible. Even in fairy tales,, the hero pauses before making his choice and spends a long time wavering about whether to go this way, that way, or another. But a choice has to be made.

As far as Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's program is concerned, you know, we have all only just heard it, one needs to formulate one's thoughts on it, so I'll give you my first impressions. It contains elements proposed by the government. Half of his proposals have been submitted and can be found in the government program and are nothing new in this respect. But a very curious idea has emerged here. It is to be found not just in his speech, but also in certain earlier speeches. I refer to a fusion of two completely opposite ideas. There has been a certain movement—and we know that it was quite a large-scale one, which stemmed from radical left sentiments and the interregional group—concerning a ration card system, a universal ration card system for the country. And at the same time, there was a completely opposite movement, as I see it, stemming from a united workers' front, concerning the introduction of monetary reform, a regressive one, and so on, demanding that millions should be clawed back from [words indistinct] and so on.

But with Boris Nikolayevich, these things have suddenly merged into one. He has proposed both. I can say quite categorically that this is unacceptable and presents a very great danger to society. We cannot even imagine—the people proposing a monetary reform—what this could lead to.

So as far as these points are concerned—and they will doubtless be submitted for discussion when the resolution is adopted—I think that the government will unambiguously and strongly defend its position that both are unacceptable. [end recording] [video shows Abalkin replying to Orlov's question during the news conference]

Gorbachev Addresses Congress 15 Dec on Agenda

LD1512230789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2108 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Remarks by Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, at the 15 December session of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] First comrades, very many people have put thier names down to speak in the debate on the government's report and despite the fact that yesterday we held an exchange of opinions and discussion in sections, nevertheless the desire on the part of the comrade deputies is enormous and many are experiencing dissatisfaction. Couldn't we discuss the following question: to continue the debate on the government's report to complete both the debate and the concluding address of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers by 1400 Hours? [murmurings in the hall]

I will put forward all the proposals now and then you can think about them. The proposals are: tomorrow from 1600 to discuss the question of changing the Constitution. Three hours. Three hours. [murmurings in the hall] Not enough? We will, we, the congress—for the present I am putting forward a proposal—we could carry on sitting until 2000. [murmuring in the hall] We have worked together until 2100. Comrade Shalayev will think about it and will tell us. [laughter]

Now, comrades, on 17 December we have a day off. On 18 December, from 1000 to 1230, it is proposed to adopt a law on changing the Constitution and hear a report about standing orders. That is to say we begin tomorrow afternoon and complete the issue of changing the Constitution and hear the report on the standing orders between 1000 and 1230. Then from 1230 to 1600 we have an interval in the work of the congress to bid farewell to Academician Sakharov, Andrey Dmitriyevich. From 1700 we complete discussion of the draft standing orders and possibly adopt the law that was passed practically unanimously in the Supreme Soviet. Then on Tuesday, 19 December, we could begin with our newly established order and timetable of work. Perhaps this, too, is an ideal pattern, but nevertheless it is close to reality and it takes into consideration what has arisen, in the first place in the course of the discussion—we must take this into account. I suggest that we will still have to extend it further tomorrow.

Second, we have to bid farewell to Andrey Dmitriyevich. We could adopt this as a basis, Comrades, and then if something crops up later, we could made amendments. [murmuring in the hall] You know what we will do now; we will instruct the Presidium and the secretariat to take, well, we have some people from the republics, some from the autonomous entities, you remember what we established at the first congress. In addition there is, so to speak, the wider public opinion, both have to be taken into consideration. Let this enrich the discussion. Those are the proposals. If you agree, comrades, we could conclude things today and continue work like that tomorrow.

Resolution on Ethnic Rights Adopted

LD1512172989 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

In its November 28 resolution the USSR Supreme Soviet assigned the government to form state commissions to handle practical issues connected with the restoration of rights of the Soviet Germans and Crimean Tatars.

The text of the resolution was circulated at the Second Congress of People's Deputies today.

The decision was adopted after the completion of work by corresponding parliamentary commissions set up in accordance with a resolution of the first congress.

Panel Decision on Meskhetian Turks

LD1512190189 Moscow TASS in English 1839 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet commission on the problems of Meskhetian Turks circulated its conclusions and proposals at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies today.

The commission was set up after ethnic clashes between Meskhetian Turks living in Uzbekistan and the indigenous population in May-June this year. The clashes resulted in loss of life. About 17,000 Turks later moved from Uzbekistan to central areas of the Russian Federation.

Later on, due to fears for their safety, a considerable proportion of Meskhetian Turks from other regions of Uzbekistan left for a number of regions of the country.

More than 60,000 Turks have already left Uzbekistan and about 40,000 of them settled in Azerbaijan, the commission's document points out.

In order to solve the problem of the Meskhetian Turks, the parliamentary commission suggests that the USSR Council of Ministers together with the Government of Georgia work out a programme for the stage-by-stage return of Meskhetian Turks and their provision with all amenities in the places of their former residence on the territory of Georgia from where they were deported on Stalin's orders in 1944.

It is recommended that local government agencies and public organisations of Georgia work to create a favourable moral and psychological climate for that.

Considering that many Meskhetian Turks that left Uzbekistan have settled in Azerbaijan, the commission supports the republican government's proposal on establishing settlements for the Turks in Azerbaijan.

The commission also suggested establishing a national cultural association of Meskhetian Turks and called for work to compensate for the material damage done to the Turks as a result of the Ferghana events.

The commission's suggestions will be considered by the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Armenian Deputy Explains Congress Walkout

LD1612193689 Moscow World Service in English 0810 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] On the first day of the Congress the people's deputies from Armenia walked out. They also failed to appear at the morning session the next day when Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov was to present the government program for putting the economy on its feet. So what happened? Our correspondent talked to one of the Armenian deputies, Khoren Abramyan, after his group returned to the hall. Khoren Abramyan looked concerned and tired:

[Begin recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] [Abramyan] I'm probably tired from thinking and worrying. We Armenians had to walk out.

[Correspondent] But why?

[Abramyan] The situation in Armenia is tense. Problems have been piling up in the past 2 years. Perestroyka and glasnost gave us the hope something would be done to rectify the wrong done by Stalin, say in the matter of Nagorno Karabakh. The situation in our republic is very complicated: First we had an earthquake, then came an economic blockade by neighboring Azerbaijan. Now it's winter and very cold in our republic, down to 20 and even 30 degrees below zero centigrade. But when the matter was put to a vote the majority of the congres deputies did not want to discuss it. So we walked out in protest.

[Correspondent] What was the reaction to the walkout?

[Abramyan] It upset the congress Presidium and Mikhail Gorbachev. Later President Gorbachev met with our group in an interval between sittings. We explained the reason for our walkout. Mikhail Gorbachev said the situation in the country was acute and Congress would take up the matter of the blockade at a closed sitting. So we decided to return to the hall. [end recording]

Moscow TV Relays 16 Dec Congressional Session

1300 GMT

LD1612151989

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 16 December begins to broadcast a recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies morning session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Mocow.

At 1310 GMT a picture of the Assembly Hall is shown, a male deputy is speaking with Vorotnikov in the presidium. The deputy reads out a threat letter to him. Kuban is ready to work in the new conditions. Financial autonomy is a state of mind, something that has to be constantly on workers' minds. He criticizes Estonian financial autonomy. The first thing that needs to be carried out is pricing reform. Gorbachev and Lukyanov are also visible in the presidium. He gives a comparison of cattle figures in Kuban with the stagnation period, and describes the hard life of a farmer.

At 1320 GMT Deputy Lemesheva, of Vitebsk oblast, starts speaking. Social discrimination against the rural workers must be ended. Capital investments in the countryside have increased somewhat, but very little. He quotes examples, and wants more money spent on the countryside. Women do the most difficult work in our society, on top of that they give birth to children and bring them up. He calls for a program to be drawn up to improve women's conditions in rural areas, using foreign experience.

At 1330 GMT Deputy Gidaspov, from Leningrad, starts speaking. He observes that Ryzhkov's program does not give all the answers. He lists Leningrad's achievements. Everything that the country needed, Leningrad has done. Housing is in a very bad way in Leningrad. Hospitals beds and cinemas are very backward, compared with other towns in the USSR. Leningrad's monuments are suffering. The development of tourism, both internal and foreign, is envisaged. Development funds are being blocked by the ministries. Capital investments in 1990 in the social infrastructure are lower than in previous years. A combination of state regulations and independent initiatives is the way forward. He criticises certain aspects of the law on state enterprises as being in contradiction with the economic mechanism. Regional financial autonomy entails certain negative aspects, including shortfalls in scheduled deliveries of named raw materials from other republics. Leningrad is sticking to its supply obligations, however. Conversion, however, is very important as there are very many defense enterprises in the city. Conversion is a very heavy burden on these enterprises. He calls for well-thought out decisions so that one does not get unwanted results.

At 1346 GMT Deputy Filshin, official of the Soviet of the Union starts speaking. He asks: To what extent is the 1990 plan in accordance with the needs of society? The governemnt is trying to get out of the crisis by old methods. The collapsing consumer market needs the most urgent measures. Attitudes toward that market need to be changed so that one does not have to keep depending on the foreign market. Investment in that consumer government has been unspeakably low. The plan does not offer much improvement and that is called a turn toward social problems. He compares figures for investments in the nonproduction sphere which only in 1995 will reach the level of the sixties. This shows a gap between words and deeds. He criticizes unfinished building sites, observing that when they are completed, these works will have equipment that will be entirely obsolete. He touches on the conversion of the defense complex and gives some very critical examples of what has happened. The trouble is that the old structure has been retained and everything remains secret. The construction of aircraft carriers will not yield anything. The illusion people now have is that people that took us into the crisis will take us out of it. When the bell rings there is some shouting that he should stop. However, there is some applause for a proposal he makes on the budget. He supports Yeltsin in his proposal to take banking out of the government's control to combat inflation. Let's give the government 3 months to show it can achieve something. A commisson then formed should judge the government and if it is found to be incapable, it should resign. This proposal receives applause.

At 1406 GMT Deputy Khabibullin, from Bashkir Oblast starts speaking and immediately voices support for the government program, to applause. The chairman calls for respect.

At 1410 GMT Khabibullin continues to say that the conversion of the defense industry is going slowly in Bashkiria. Thought has not been given to what should be done with workers made redundant. Because of haste in the conversion process, the quality of the equipment being produced for the food industry is poor. Help in rural areas is slow in coming. Farms' debts must be written off. Because of a shortage of tanker cars, petrochemical deliveries have fallen behind. There is paralysis at a number of enterprises in the republic. Ony high discipline and good organization can provide a way out of the crisis.

A 1420 GMT Deputy Orlov, from Perm Oblast, says it is unfortunate that the economy is still being run along command-administrative lines, and a radical and flexible policy is needed. After all, Lenin's New Economic Policy did rather well. We must not try to tackle all the problems at once. This will spread efforts too thinly. The legacy of barrack socialism has created a mentality of excessive dependency on the state. Over 25 percent of what we produce is wasted, so efficiency must be improved. A new work attitude is required. Stagnation must be avoided.

1436 GMT

LD1612162389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1436 GMT on 16 December continues its recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies morning session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1436 GMT Deputy Alferov, from the USSR Academy of Sciences, says that in the same way as one should not blame Pushkin and Dostoyevskiy for Russian illiteracy in the 19th century, scientists today can hardly be blamed for primitive equipment in the countryside. New faculties and new specialized colleges are needed to develop science, but one should not impose standardized solutions on everyone. Scientific curricula and programs must be more imaginative. Soviet scientists have come up with new ideas, but state backing and international cooperation are needed to develop them. We don't need extremist groups such as Pamyat on the right and the Democratic Union on the left. He says he sometimes has more in common with worker Smirnov than "corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences Gidaspov." Financial autonomy should be left to enterprises, not regions, which should run their economy through tax measures. [video shows Gorbachev shown listening] No one will build "turn-key" socialism for the Soviet Union. We must build a new and democratic society based on the values of the civilized world.

At 1452 GMT Deputy Ubaydullayeva, from the Uzbek Academy of Sciences, refers to a speech yesterday by Professor Bronshteyn and expresses a protest on behalf of Uzbek women. It is not the republic's high birth rate that has caused the republic's problems, but mistaken economic policies to do with the cotton industry. Children are undernourished, despite the republic's potential for crop-growing, and women are anemic. She demands a public apology from Bronshteyn.

At 1456 GMT a deputy tries to speak, but is not allowed to. The chairman reads out an apology from Bronshteyn, who says he feels that his remarks yesterday may have been offensive to the Uzbeks. A 15 minute interval is then announced.

At 1513 GMT the transmission resumes. Video shows deputies taking their seats.

At 1516 GMT the floor is offered to General Moiseyev, chief of general staff. Moiseyev says the army's achievements depend on supplied material, according to Engels. The government program ensures that the Armed Forces can be maintained at a level of reasonable sufficiency. He lists Soviet peace initiatives and praises their reception abroad. But the Army has thoughts of its own on the conversation of military industry. The defense complex is reorientating toward consumer goods production, but it cannot be forced to decline from high-precision military equipment to lower-quality consumer goods. On national formations within the Army, he cites earlier decisions that the Army must develop in accordance with previous principles. Decisions taken by the Lithuanian and Georgian parliaments on setting up their own formations are unconstitutional. Dilettantist approaches to the Army are unacceptable. National formations were tried out during the civil war, but the Soviet Army is a very different animal today. It is impossible to satisfy the demands of those who call for national formations. Security concerns are those of the whole state, not individual parts, and the Army cannot afford to let its guard down. Conscripts serve in many parts of the USSR and abroad, and they cannot be redistributed to their own areas. The Soviet Constitution guarantees equality for all; national formations would violate that. The resources do not exist to set up the infrastructure for local formations, and it is important to issue orders in several different languages. Some of the greatest victories in World War II were won by various Soviet peoples fighting side by side. The fruits of nationalist agitation can be seen all too clearly today. Tense interethnic relations make one wonder what would happen if national locally-commanded units existed in the republics.

1534 GMT

LD1612165589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1534 GMT 16 December continues its recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies morning session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1534 GMT the floor is given to Academician Arbatov, who talks of the blow struck against the cold war in recent years. No developed country spends such a high proportion of GNP on defense as does the USSR today. The Army and the arms industry were given a free hand in the years of stagnation. This led to violations of treaties, such as the Krasnoyarsk radar. The USSR and the United States are also the world's largest arms traders. Past policies have made the country a major debtor. Present defense cuts are proceeding too timidly. Even the Pentagon is proposing major cuts over the next 5 years. He cites comparative spending figures on health and education in the USSR and the United States. Those areas are the most important preconditions for security today. He distinguishes between necessary defense readiness and unnecessary overspending on arms. Officers should not bear the burden of defense cuts, and army leaders should take care of such people and their families. Social facilities for army families should take precedence over aircraft carriers. Military secrecy is excessive. The Army has lived in a greenhouse for too long, and should be exposed to the fresh winds of the market. It has the resources to help the country's economic development.

Prosperity depends also on developing foreign economic ties, but without organizing by decree. A practice which discouraged potential foreign partners has ensued. We need cooperation projects which help to develop the food and consumer goods industries and the export sector.

The Ryzhkov report should not be adopted. He should answer for it personally as the Ryzhkov report and not hide behind official titles. [applause]

At 1550 GMT the floor is offered to Ryabkov of Chelyabinsk, who says it is necessary to ask whether we want socialism or capitalism. It is a delusion to believe that the free market will lead to a sharp increase in prosperity. Rather, the rich will get richer and the poor poorer. The transition to a market economy will lead to chaos. The economy cannot function properly without a central control function. Wage increases are not enough. People need things to buy with their money.

At 1603 GMT Matyukha, of Tyumen Oblast, takes the floor. He says that the government report has outlined the reasons and solutions for the economic crisis. Matyukha complains that R40,000 million of profit have gone from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) to the other republics. Matyukha complains that Russia fairs worse than the other republics, compared with its contributions to the national economy. Therefore Matyukha calls for equivalent exchange of commodities between the republics. The Russian birth rate has fallen. The demographic situation in the RSFSR requires ameliorative measures. The questions of inter-republican emigration and immigration demand examination, as well as entry and exit from the USSR itself.

At 1614 GMT Matyukha goes on to recount the economic problems of Bashkiria and Tataria, where oil workers are not given the minimum amount of meat. On the other hand, in the other republics profits are disposed of by the republics themselves. Matyukha recounts ministerial economic blunders in Tyumen Oblast and Tobolsk Oblast. The time bell rings. He goes on to ask for war veterans to be given housing with modern amenities.

1621 GMT

LD1612162589

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1621 GMT on 16 December continues its recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1621 GMT Deputy Kashperko, of Gomel Oblast, takes the floor. He expresses Belorussian concern about the Chernobyl accident. Two million Belorussians are affected. Kashperko has thoroughly examined the Ryzhkov report. He is concerned about the safety of the Belorussian people in infected zones. He says that measures should not wait for the 13th 5-year plan on this issue.

At 1624 GMT he first calls for a thorough investigation of the infected regions. There are points among inhabited areas of very high radiation. Secondly, Gomel Oblast has suffered most of all, and despite a lot of discussion the situation has not been dealt with. The cries for help from Belorussia are not an attempt to pull the blanket away from others, but a legitimate demand. Four years have passed since chernobyl, but a universal concept of safety in the region has not yet been established. Children are not getting sufficient nutrition. Thirdly, Gomel compares poorly with Japan vis-a-vis medical provisions. Kashperko asks for Chazov's opinion on health care in Belorussia.

At 1630 GMT Kashperko calls for vital medical supplies, paid for, if necessary, with hard currency. Kashperko calls for state and collective farms to be consolidated as a solution to the agrarian crisis.

At 1634 GMT the chairman asks for a vote to continue the debate. There are about 20 hands for. The chairman calls for Ryzhkov to speak. Ryzhkov is to answer questions which have cropped up during the day's speeches. Ryzhkov says that the deputies should reject shock therapy methods.

At 1640 GMT Ryzhkov notes that the plan for social development for next year has been thoroughly discussed. Discussions at the congress were very constructive on this subject. Diametrically opposed opinions continue to be expressed on the role of the state in the national economy. The government believes that the state order for 1990 is correct, diminishing gradually. Ryzhkov thinks that perhaps the budget is not completely coordinated with new forms of ownership and economic operations.

At 1647 GMT he points out that the present task is to create a fundamentally new economic mechanism. No small number of useful proposals have been made on investment policy and other subjects. The council of ministers asks the congress to support the next 5-year plan and to adopt the economic draft laws put forward by the beginning of 1990. Ryzhkov takes full responsibility for the program. (applause)

At 1651 GMT the chairman asks for any remarks from the floor. He then suggests that those deputies who have not been able to speak can get their remarks published in the congress bulletin. The interregional group is asked to remain in the hall. An interval until 1600 (1300 gmt) is announced.

At 1655 GMT the chairman introduces Lukyanov, who talks about the atmosphere at the session. Economic and political reform have really started.

He speaks about the draft law on amendments and additions to the constitution, which is the next subject on the congress agenda. It is an extremely important law for the success of perestroyka. He deals with the question of elections as reflected in the law, with the question of changes to republican constitutions. the draft law provides for much more democracy in the election procedure. national and local conditions are taken into account. articles 89-91 of the constitution are to be rephrased.

At 1701 GMT Lukyanov talks about the possibilities under the new law for different procedures in forming the presidiums of the supreme soviets of the republics. The relationship between central bodies of authority and local bodies is redefined. He says that both a Congress of People's Deputies and regular meetings of the Supreme Soviet are necessary.

The sore question of the election of deputies from public organization's is discussed.

1710 GMT

LD1612183489

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1710 GMT on 16 December continues its recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies session in Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1710 GMT Lukyanov says that there should be no direct election of the chairman of the Supreme Soviet by the people. The president would then be rather remote from the main representative organ of power, the Supreme Soviet. The question of the participation of young people in the election procedures is provided for in the draft law. There is to be no limitation of the number of candidates who can stand in any constituency. The law is to provide an equal chance for all candidates in elections. Lukyanov says that is the end of his briefing on what the new law contains. The relationship between the center and the republics is fundamental to the debate.

At 1716 GMT Lukyanov says that there has been extensive discussion on the draft law. The Constitutional Commission came to the conclusion that the draft law should be introduced and passed only after it has ben thoroughly discussed. It should not be rushed through. Corrections to the principles of the federation are needed in all spheres. The provisions of the Constitution on the question of ownership need to be changed. It has not yet been possible to find solutions to these questions that please everyone.

At 1723 GMT Lukyanov says that a draft law on the socialist enterprise has been put forward by the government. The new laws in sum are basis for perestroyka. The Constitution is the cornerstone of the changes.

At 1726 GMT Lukyanov says that it is expedient that the congress should charge the government with accelerating the adoption of new laws. It must be remembered that every law passed is a building block of the constitutional framework of the country.

At 1730 GMT the chairman asks for questions to Lukyanov in written form.

At 1731 GMT Masaliyev, first secretary of the Communist Party of Kirghizia, talks about the discusion on the draft law on constitutional changes in his republic. He says that he and the Kirghiz deputies support the draft law on the Constitution as it stands in as far as it develops democracy in the country. It is important to improve the representation of the working class and the peasantry and also war veterans in the ranks of people's deputies. He raises the question of language in the republics and multicandidate constituencies. He condemns labor disturbancies by unofficial organizations who undermine perestroyka. He condemns a publication by the Moscow People's Front on the social situation in Kirghizia. Do they really know better than local deputies?

At 1743 GMT Deputy Antifeyev, from Donetsk Oblast, talks about the draft law on the Constitution. He says that no candidate should be excluded from elections because of their inability to pay for the election campaign that may be needed.

At 1744 GMT Deputy Allamuradov, from Namangan Oblast, takes the floor. He begins by praising voters for actively participating in the elections. He speaks for the discussion of the competence of republics in elections. Allamuradov reminds the deputies that they belong to a federation and that it is not possible to engage in feverish reform of everything and everyone at once.

At 1749 GMT Deputy Allamuradov continues about the need for reform in parliamentary procedures.

At 1754 GMT Deputy (?Zhakselekov) supports the draft law on the Constitution. He also mentions the fact that few farm workers and representatives of the working class are represented in the Supreme Soviet. He says that it is all very well to use the experience of the West, but one should remember that capitalist trampled on their workers for 200 years. The words—power to the people—should acquire real content. There must be real protection for the rights of the workers. He reads out an appeal from the people of Semipalatinsk to deal with the awful ecological situation there. He is asked by the chairman to get back to the subject.

1806 GMT

LD1612200789

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1806 GMT on 16 December continues its recorded relay of the Second USSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

At 1806 GMT Deputy Margvelashvili from Tbilisi City, talks about raising the responsibility of the deputy before those who have elected him.

At 1809 GMT he proposes changes to the orders concerning the punishment of deputies guilty of wrongdoing.

At 1814 GMT Lukyanov starts to speak on recommendations of various commissions which need to be discussed.

At 1816 GMT Deputy Guskova, from Astrakhan town, says that the questions of congresses as the highest form of authority has aroused many arguments. Many nationalities want their representatives in the republics' supreme soviets. At least two candidates should be proposed for every seat. The Constitution must allow any number of candidates to be put forward for election. She criticizes the fact that there are fewer female deputies than male ones.

At 1829 GMT the chairman proposes that remaining speeches not be heard but given to the secretariat to be considered when decisions are being made. Deputy Shelukhin tries to speak but is told to sit down. A vote is taken on this proposal—manually, not with electronic voting system—; some confusion results.

At 1826 GMT Deputy Shelukhin, from Ulyanovsk Oblast, takes the floor. He talks on qualifications for being able to be elected a deputy.

At 1828 GMT an unidentified deputy talks on behalf of the society for the blind. He talks of the difficulties of the disabled in the USSR. He is concerned with facilities provided for the disabled. Many problems have already been solved. He talks of the experiences in France where much more concern is shown by the authorities for the problems of the disabled. In the Soviet Union life is much more difficult for the disabled. Local authorities should do more to help.

The chairman then announces a 30-minute break.

At 1840 GMT Primakov speaks about regulations that stipulate that no bad language can be used at the congress. Articles 4, 50, 77, 98, 99, and 173 of the draft regulations demand corresponding alterations to the constitution. On the problems of renewing the Supreme Soviet, the proposal of the committee of the Supreme Soviet has been adopted, which provides for effective rotation. Chambers have the right to reelect chairmen of chambers and commissions and committees. A new article, 182, has been included in the draft on information provided to the congress.

In the draft regulations there is a clause that the structure and personnel of the Supreme Soviet be established by the Supreme Soviet Presidium. Gabrusev and Kirillov have raised the question of information in local press on voting by name. Medvedev has said that it would be expedient to qualify the two thirds majority of deputies.

There are 185 articles in the regulations. More than 240 proposals were received for them. Primakov suggests not opening debate now, but passing on proposals for later discussion.

At 1908 GMT the proposal is put to the vote. The proposal is passed.

Primakov announces arrangement for Sakharov's funeral, as agreed upon with his wife. On Monday last respects will be paid at Luzhniki from 1300 to 1400. The funeral will follow.

The 16 December relay of the USSR Congress of People's Deputies concludes at 1915 GMT.

Deputies Address 16 Dec Congress Session

Leningrad's Gidaspov on Economic Reform

LD1712135789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1330 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Speech by Deputy Boris Veniaminovich Gidaspov from Leningrad at the Second Congress of People's Deputies in Moscow on 16 December—recorded]

[Excerpts] Esteemed colleagues, esteemed chairman, the very important legislative acts that were adopted at the last session of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the program proposed by the government to improve the economy have been from our viewpoint forced and timely measures. Here in the intervals between the sessions there have repeatedly been gatherings of various groups of deputies—Leningraders and non-Leningraders—who have been debating and arguing themselves hoarse, but, truthfully speaking, no one has been able to propose anything that might serve as a realistic alternative to what has been proposed by the government. At the same time, however, the government's report does not provide answers to many fundamental questions, especially in respect of the mechanism for virtually eliminating existing imbalances. We have somehow already grown accustomed to the fact that we can put forward slogans, we can set ourselves goals, but at the last moment we forget about how these goals are indeed to be achieved. [passage omitted]

The further implementation of economic reform in accordance with the complex of large-scale one-off measures put forward by the government in order to recreate a market does not contain a clear approach to the creation of a mechanism to regulate it. We are now going through a very complex transitional stage. I am clearly aware of this, and as a former economic manager I have been encountering in a different way over the last few months the problems of Leningrad and oblast and am viewing them differently. But in our opinion the cornerstone of this problem at the present stage is the quest for an optimal combination of state administration and the independence of labor collectives. It must be only a combination. Otherwise there will certainly be no way out of the situation that now exists. In other words the levers of state regulation must not be removed until all the objective internal conditions are created. The levers during the transitional period must function in synchronism. [passage omitted]

The introduction of financial autonomy relationships is impossible without correct organization and state regulation. The dismantling of the command-administrative system and the restructuring of the economic mechanism require new organizational structures that will break down the existing monopolism. [passage omitted]

A separate issue—but I am aware that I only have 1 minute left—is the question of conversion. This is a very important issue for Leningrad, since we have a very large number of defense enterprises. Conversion which was begin in 1989 without the laying down of any fundamental approaches disrupted the production plans of the enterprises in the defense complex. Moreover, it coincided with the transition to full financial autonomy and self-financing. Together with the mounting economic confusion in the national economic complex conversion has been an additional heavy burden on the collectives of state enterprises. Once again we have not waited for someone else to tackle this problem. We created a financial-autonomous sub-department which is engaged on matters relating to conversion in Leningrad and Leningrad region, and have already accomplished a great deal in this area. Progressive equipment for food processing is being produced as well as progressive equipment for agriculture at our defense enterprises. We are ourselves tackling most of the issues, but this does also require solutions on a statewide scale. [passage omitted]

General Moiseyev on Armed Forces

LD1612224889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1516 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Speech by Army General Mikhail Alekseyevich Moiseyev, chief of general staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy defense minister, at the 16 December session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies, nothing is as dependent on economic conditions as are the army and the navy. Armaments, composition, organization, tactics, and strategy depend first and foremost on the level of production and means of communication that have been achieved at the given moment. All the organization and the combat power and method of the army and at the same time victories and defeats find themselves dependent on material, that is to say economic conditions, on human material and on weapons and consequently on the quality and numbers of the population and on equipment. Those are the words of Friedrich Engels, whose selected works have been published by the Military Publishing House.

The government's program that we have been debating at today's congress envisages as a whole a reduction on defense expenditure but at the same time ensures the maintenance of our Armed Forces at a level of reasonable sufficiency for the defense of our peaceful initiatives. Our peaceful initiatives have made it possible to approach from different standpoints the maintenance and construction of the Armed Forces. The halting of nuclear tests, the abolition of medium- and shorter-range missiles, the 50-percent reduction of the strategic offensive armaments adopted this year in Malta, the unilateral reduction in the Armed Forces by 500,000 men, and a number of other peaceful initiatives are meeting with the understanding and support of the whole of mankind and will make it possible to direct the released funds to tackling tasks in the national economy. We therefore share the position of the party and government and the concept forming the basis of Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report.

At the same time we do have our own deliberations, particularly on matters relating to the conversion of the defense sectors of industry. We are in favor of conversion, since at the present time, carrying out national economic tasks, the defense complex has undertaken the complex and crucial task of producing consumer goods. We are producing television sets, refrigerators, and various types of equipment, and at the present time the defense complex is being redesignated for the production of consumer goods. However, comrade deputies, I would ask you to be very careful in your assessment of our defense complex. It is a complex and crucial organism and one must not now transfer those branches of the defense complex which were oriented to the production of high-precision weapons and equipment several rungs down to the production of consumer goods. This will definitely do damage above all to our scientific and technological potential and reduce the arsenal of our scientific developments and a number of other promising areas.

One of the acute issues facing us in the matter of restructuring the Armed Forces which has become a subject of discussion at today's congress is the issue of national formations. Of late proposals have been received from certain public organizations and individual representatives of the intelligentsia in the republics of the Baltic region, the Transcaucasus, Moldavia and Central Asia that national formations be created and there be a transition to the principle of the territorial manning of the Armed Forces.

They have been examined at every level whenever they concerned the problems of military construction. In particular, the issue was also discussed at the First Congress of People Deputies, and as you know it was decided that the further qualitative development of the Armed Forces should be carried out in accordance with the existing principles of manpower acquisition. Nevertheless, the controversy over this continues, and it is not just a matter of proposals.

On 29 September the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet, in violation of Article 71, adopted a decision which I have in my hands here. The decision states that beginning in 1990 citizens of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] should be allowed, if they so wish, to do their military service in the territory of the Lithuanian republic or, if this is not possible, somewhere nearby and perhaps in the Baltic Military District. It states that national military formations should be set up in the Lithuanian SSR in which Lithuanian citizens could serve; that conscription of citizens from Lithuania's construction sector to [word indistinct] subordinated to the Ministry of Defense, and a number of other points of that nature.

On 30 November, a similar decision was adopted by the Georgian Supreme Soviet. Such attempts to give these proposals a legal nature within the framework of republican legislation contradict our Constitution and are incompatible with the tasks of ensuring reliable defense of the country.

As you know, a crucial role is played in accomplishing these tasks by our strategic forces—the strategic rocket forces, forces that are used by the navy and our Air Force. I would ask all the deputies sitting in this hall and those who are addressing similar questions to the Ministry of Defense whether these forces can be organized-...[changes thought] Can we maintain these Armed

Forces on the territory of a republic today, forces that confront our probable foe? Common sense tells us that not to equip, not to deploy them within this or that republic, and especially not to man them fully, not to mention not training people for one's own armed forces, is impossible. Over the years of perestroyka we have come to realize that nothing tolerates incompetence—neither art nor politics and especially not military issues. The army is a complex organization and I think that a dilettante and parochial approach to such issues is impermissable.

I want to talk briefly on this very delicate subject because nowadays everyone is telling us what armed forces we should have, how to construct the Soviet Army and how to bring up the young generation. I'm getting the impression that all those with nothing to do today have decided to choose the Armed Forces as their target and have turned into Ministry of Defense Advisors.

The issue of national formations is not a new one. Over the 70 years of our Armed Forces' development both territorial and ex-territorial principles have been tried. National formations appeared in the Red Army for the first time during the Civil War. But I have to say that at that time with the equipment and weapons that existed—horses, blades, carbines, and horse-drawn machine- guns—and that was it, and infantry regiments—that's what the formations consisted of. Today, however, the Soviet Army is a mighty industrial organism armed with top-class equipment and systems, and if one is to judge by the scientific potential serving the Armed Forces today—and 98 percent of our officer cadres have higher military education, which is something I probably don't have to tell you about. [sentence as heard]

There are three demands now being put forward in favor of creating national formations and adopting a territorial principle of manpower acquisition: Reducing the number of conscripts moved from one region to another.

Second, preserving the national environment for servicemen.

And third, keeping them within the climatic conditions which they are used to.

There is no doubt that in contemporary conditions it is practically impossible to fulfill these demands.

Why? On this account there are weighty enough reasons. In the first place, the military threat exists for the whole state and not for republics individually. Now, there is not one republic which can independently create and maintain a modern army; they do not possess the economics and potential necessary for that.

In the second place, the Armed Forces have been created and are maintained not especially for performing military service in them, but for the armed defense of the homeland. Both military service obligation and the exterritorial principle of bringing up to strength are not the advent of the command and bureaucratic apparatus but an objective need.

The military and political situation has not acquired today that irreversible character. The lowering of the combat readiness of the Armed Forces cannot be allowed today.

Proceeding from that, the deployment of troops on the territory of the country and beyond its borders is being implemented out of the demands of necessary defense on the basis of the evaluation of the action of the ranks of the enemy. Groupings are also being created and deployed in sectors and regions adequate to the degree of the military threat.

Today, the demand of the Armed Forces on limited resources is such that in certain regions it does correspond to the [words indistinct] (?available tank) conscripts. The majority of them are deployed in Central Europe, Central Asia and Transcaucasia. Servicemen of the army and navy have to perform military service in Kamchatka, in the Kuriles and on all the waters of our world ocean, and in rocket troops and anti-aircraft defense troops. Therefore, from the military point of view, the proposal to go over now to that principle is absurd.

The union republics have different possibilities in bringing national military formations up to strength. How can the question of which republic should have how many and which national military formations be resolved? For instance, take numerical strength. In Uzbekistan, there are approximately 10 times more than in Estonia. However, the interests of defense do not at all demand having in Uzbekistan 10 times more troops than in Estonia, for example.

An analysis of the correlation of forces and resources of opposing groupings of NATO shows that national formations alone on our western borders will obviously not be sufficient to resolve the defense task.

In keeping with the United Nations universal declaration of the rights of man and the USSR Constitution all people are equal among themselves. Over 100 nations and ethnic groups inhabit the USSR. Justice demands the creation of national military formations for national minorities, then. Or can their interests be disregarded for the sake of their manpower acquisition for troops, for example, performing military service abroad and in other difficult regions, especially climatic ones?

And in the third place, the performing of military service of national formations according to place of residence will not guarantee the training of military-taught specialists in another respect, either. In the past, when the army was not armed with complex combat equipment and the number of miltary specialists was insignificant, such a problem essentially did not exist. Now the army and navy are armed with hundreds and thousands of designations of equipment and the number of various military specialists runs to thousands. For motorized rifle divisions alone, it is necessary to train servicemen to the tune of several hundred military registered specialists. A strict system of training these Armed Forces specialists has been created for this. It is completely understandable that it is a very complex and difficult matter to organize their training in every separate region or republic.

National formations will require national officer cadres, too. Neither do they have enough forces or resources for their training for setting up a system of military colleges in every republic.

In the fourth place, serious problems will arise with the organization of command and control. It is clear that under any principle of manpower acquisition, the Armed Forces have to be administered and administered in a centralized way, to be led in one language. And, for instance, one cannot allow the headquarters [upravleniye] of the Baltic military district, or of another region—the Transcaucasus—to issue their orders and directives in several languages. What command and control [upravleniye] can one speak of in that case?

Great difficulties will also arise in the creation and publication of general military regulations and field manuals, in manuals and textbooks in many languages. Today, too, we are forced to have translators, for those youths who come to serve in the army, especially from our outlying areas, have a weak command of the Russian language.

And finally, the last thing. The practice of many years confirms that the ex-territorial principle of manpower acquisition is preferable from the point of view of the development and deepening of national relations. After all, in 1941 Hitler counted on causing our peoples, both large and small, to fall out, thus sowing national hostility and, spilling less blood, conquering or taking possession of, seizing, the Soviet Union. And we know the shining examples of heroic battles, be it near Moscow, on the Volga, at the Kursk bulge, in the liberation of the Baltic, or during the storming of the Reichstag when Russian and Ukrainian, Uzbek and Azerbaijani, Georgian and Armenian, all the nationalities of our multinational homeland, fought shoulder to shoulder.

It is true that sometimes the quality of the arguments, using the territorial system of construction, leads to instances of unhealthy mutual relations between servicemen of different nationalities.

Even our Baltic newspapers have used the Congress of People's Deputies, too. Yesterday, I specially took the newspaper KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA LITVY which carries an analysis of some group of scientists and economists. But, I will say that, gathered there is such filth and something the like of which had never been seen [nepropodobiye] that even if I wanted to write such a thing, my imagination probably would not stretch that far.

Incidentally, talking about the stirring up of these nationalistic moods, they are already yielding their bitter fruits. I have information here for today on how the conscription of servicemen is going. Today in our country there are over 7,500 who refuse to do military service [otkaznik]. I can give a positive example. After all, only the youths of Azerbaijan are not refusing to do army service today. While all the others—Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Moldavia, Armenia, Georgia, and other youths—criminal proceedings have been started against 1,482 of them. I think that there is great scope for our work here.

Incidentally, we are not talking in absolutes, nor giving any kind of [bell rings]...I am finishing...principles of manpower acquisition. The Ministry of Defense has adopted a decision and is allowing youths to perform military service in the republics—20-22% of youths are performing their military service according to place of residence. Moreover, these questions cannot be examined without taking account of the tension which has evolved recently in interethnic relations in several regions of the republics. It is not difficult to surmise to what unpredictable consequences the development of events might lead if, in the union republics, national military formations were created which were completely at their disposal. After all, today, blood is being shed, too.

Thus, the specific features of the present stage of the construction of multinational Armed Forces are determined by the new political thinking: The demands of the defensive military doctrine and the transition of the army and the fleet to qualitative parameters of their development, the strengthening of (?transnationalism) and the unity of the army of the people. All of that is incompatible with the demands put forward for the performance of military service by citizens of the country on the territory of their republic alone and with the creation of national military formations.

In conclusion, we will examine that question of crimes, of that wild outburst [razgul] which we have in our country. I would like to say that in connection with such a negative attitude toward servicemen of the army and fleet, attacks in our country have increased on officers and army warrant officers [praporshchik]. Moreover, this year, 53 officers have been killed; of these, 11 senior level officers, 23 navy and army warrant officers [michman i praporshchik]; these are those people who were performing their military duty. The largest number of murders of officers and army and navy warrant officers are taking place on the territory of the Leningrad, Far East, Moscow, Transcaucasus, and Turkestan okrugs. Instances of hooliganism toward officers and army warrant officers have also grown more frequent in the streets of Moscow and Leningrad. I think it is our common concern and common task. I thank you for your attention.

Arbatov on Economic Development

LD1712175489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1534 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Speech by Academician Georgiy Arbatov at the 16 December session of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] Comrade deputies, one of the topics that has not yet been touched upon is those opportunities for the development of the economy and the success of restructuring that have been opened up by our new foreign policy, particularly by the fact that it has been possible to destroy former ideas about us and the image of us as the enemy that had been formed over decades by the public worldwide. In depriving the United States and the West of this enemy, we dealt a crushing blow to all the structures of the cold war and in essence, made it quite futile. I see the topic of these new possibilities as extremely topical, not only because some of our conservative figures are using, at extremely high-level gatherings, the very fact of the dramatically improved attitude toward us on the part of the international public as a pretext to attack restructuring or its initiator, the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and general secretary of our party.

I decided to speak about this here at the congress for another and profoundly practical reason, which is directly linked to the discussion of Comrade Ryzhkov's report. The point is that these new possibilities are not materializing on their own accord. It depends on us whether we take advantage of this chance or not. Can we by doing so make it easier and quicker to overcome the crisis and reach the open road of economic and social progress? The first of these possibilities is to make serious cuts in military spending.

Fate and the Presidium's will have decreed, comrades, that I am speaking immediately after General Moiseyev and I hope that you will not harbor any suspicion that we, that what I have to say has been inspired by his speech. We are urgently in need of such cuts. Not one developed state in the world is spending more than nine percent of its gross domestic national product on military expenditure as we do. In the United States, this figure is 5.5 perrcent; in the FRG, three percent; and in Japan, one percent. I must say that one of the most serious features and a legacy of stagnation consists of the fact that at that time, the military and military industry were given a completely free hand. They were genuinely given carte blanche. A great many costly and not always considered military programs were launched, some which even contravened treaties, such as the krasnoyarsk radar station, for example; they are a heavy burden on our economy even today.

Be that as it may, our Army will remain the largest in the world, even after making unilateral cuts of 500,000 in our Armed Forces, with .5 million more than in China's poorly armed army and 1.5 million more than that of the United States. We produce and possess more of almost every type of weapon than any other country in the world, apart, perhaps, from large warships and strategic bombers. And, with the United States, we share the dubious reputation of the world's biggest arms dealers. Military extravagance has already made the United States, the richest capitalist power, the world's greatest debtor and has undermined their competitive positions throughout the world, while we and our economy have been, literally, bled white. Now we have started to cut back military spending but, in my view, only timidly. As far as I can tell from the sparse information available, the reduction so far, set against the enormous levels, is really 10 percent of the growth plans for the current 5-year plan; which means only very slightly in absolute terms. Action here can be much bolder.

Certain comrades, it must be owned, are asking about reciprocity. But the United States has already begun reductions and will continue them. They have enough problems of their own, and as the cold war collapses and given the Soviet Union's new policies, they simply cannot avoid doing so. The Pentagon itself is already declaring its intention to cut military spending by $180 billion in five years, by 10 percent annually. The mood in political circles is more determined. There is talk of a need to get reductions in annual appropriations of 100 billion per annum, that is, by one-third. For us this is a most topical subject. Comrades Ryzhkov and Lavrov have mentioned certain aspects of it. By way of material for reflection, I can cite the following figures for you. In 1988, R25.5 billion were spent on health in the USSR from all sources of finance; in the United States the figure was around $200 billion.

On education, R44 billion were spent here and $251 billion dollars were spent there. We are talking about the health of a nation and of its rising generation, that is, its future. Is this not the most important component of security in today's changed circumstances? I want to make two provisos to the faces of my military colleague deputies, being aware of their concern.

First, I well understand the significance of a necessary level of defense capability. I served in the Army during the war years. I have a personal impression of what unpreparedness costs. But defense capability is not only a countless number of weapons and soldiers. By cutting—together with military expenditure—the Army and weapons, we cannot only not weaken, but strengthen defense, raising the quality of military equipment and the training of servicemen and achieving changes in the future in international circumstances. If we are talking about the future in general, then without radical cuts in military expenditure, we will hardly be able to avoid the further progressive lagging behind of the economy. That would mean that soon we will not be able to have a modern army at all. We must also think about this.

The second proviso is that I consider that we must not shift the burden of lowering military costs on officers and ensigns and their families. Not one of them should suffer. These people are, as it is, living in difficult circumstances. In general, it is embarassing for all of us and especially for the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union.

I think that Comrades Yazov, Moiseyev, Chernavin, and other military leaders should feel a bit uncomfortable before hundreds of thousands of their subordinates.

In the military department, evidently in the rush for quality, economies are made at the expense of people's social needs. After all, there are places where it can get funds. This is not an impoverished rayon soviet. The aircraft cruisers alone, which it is building, will demand expenditure which would be more than sufficient for the solution of not only the housing problem but also many other social problems in the Armed Forces.

I could say a lot here about the Committee on Issues of Defense and State Security of the Supreme Soviet, peculiarly manned and functioning in a peculiar way, and also about secrecy, which even now prevents us from getting to the bottom of these matters and it is preventing us, above all, from doing so—and not NATO and the United States.

This relates incidentally to conversion, which has been discussed here. I am not going to deal with this question. A situation in which it is the case that the military industry is, as it were, a foreign power, which is prepared to give us a few alms, seems strange to me. Meanwhile, by taking away the last morsels from ourselves, we have always nursed it, cared for it, and blown it up to an incredible size. What does it matter that people say that the military produces televisions and 40 percent of civilian produce? This is because all optics and electronics production facilities have been given away to the military. Of course, no one can produce any of this apart from them.

Comrades, I think that they really have a very serious ordeal ahead of them, because they have lived in greenhouse conditions and have been the most high-spending branch of all the high spending branches of our economy. The best of everything went to them: Personnel, science, materials. When this hothouse flower is taken outside into the cold and the winds of the market, let us see how it will behave. We have to do this quickly. Incredible resources are involved here. Comrade Ligachev said that 40 percent of the produce of machine building is tied up here. How much chemical production capacity? How much building capacity? How much else? There are great reserves here for speeding up our advance and they should be fully used.

The second matter I wanted to raise is the new opportunities that have arisen in foreign economic relations. I'd like to point out at the outset that we can and must tackle our economic problems for ourselves. We should not pin our hopes on a kind uncle from abroad. At the same time, without vigorous participation in the international division of labor today, neither the United States, nor Japan, nor the FRG, nor any other country that doesn't want to get left behind can live and develop normally. This also goes for us. We have discussed this, and we have tried to do something about it, but in recent years the situation has not only not improved, but in some ways it's gotten worse. To a large extent it is the fault of our government, including deputy prime ministers and ministers, in other words the Council of Ministers. They mainly govern by fiat, and that applies not just to this sphere. They permit some things, but prohibit more. They do not think through the possible consequences of their decisions in advance. They don't bother to create the circumstances necessary for specific innovations to catch on and begin to work. Either they rush in somewhere, or they display incomprehensible irresolution. For every step forward there is at least an equivalent step backward. That is the way we are going.

Every day, according to the most modest calculations, this costs us many tens of millions of rubles in missed profit and losses. Very profitable things are being proposed to us. For instance, through reducing the mindless, dead-end importation of grain, as well as meat and dairy products, we could organize fodder production and animal husbandry in such a way as to use only a third as much fodder per kilogram of meat and to make the fattening of pigs, for instance, last not 11-12 months, but five and a half. The American firm (?Marmon), together with the agro-industrial committee, grappled with this proposal for nine years, but the committee bungled it, as indeed it has bungled almost all other schemes. Now a fresh proposal has arrived from this American firm for organizing production in the shortest possible period of time and on the basis of advanced experience, somewhere near ports—they propose the Baltic region or Krasnodar Kray—of 1 million tonnes of meat in order to save, it is estimated, more than R2 billion in hard currency.

I fear, however, that even without the agro-industrial [complex] the plan can expect the same fate as before. So by way of an experiment, I decided to pass the proposal on to Comrade Veprev. Perhaps the Supreme Soviet will help. There are many dozens of similar examples, if not hundreds. I am talking of projects capable of substantially and rapidly improving the food situation in the country, the consumer goods situation and also the production of machines and equipment, and of helping us to develop our export potential and earn hard currency. But things are going with very great difficulty and very often end in failure. We are swiftly earning the reputation of bad and risky partners. A couple of weeks ago a big American financier said to me: Your country is the focus of interest at the moment. The business world sincerely wants to have dealings with you. But on one condition—that it can have confidence in you, that it can believe that you are stable and that your government won't change all the laws and regulations every six months. I think that our Soviet businessmen also have an interest in this.

An unusual situation is now taking shape. Barriers to foreign economic relations are beginning to come down. International financial organizations are holding their doors ajar to us. The business world is showing interest in us. and today—precisely today—we have to ask ourselves: Are we ready for this new era, this era when there are new opportunities to be exploited? Alas no—neither in the juridical, nor the financial, nor the organizational, nor the economic nor the personnel plan! We have lost time, and now it has to be made up swiftly. I think the government ought to be given such an instruction.

Finally, a brief word on Comrade Ryzhkov's report. I agree, comrades, with those who believe that the report should not be approved. It is not just because it is arousing doubts, and it is arousing very many doubts. I believe that we should not establish precedents of this sort. Let this be the Ryzhkov Plan, just as there was the Monnet Plan and the Erhard Plan. And let Comrade Ryzhkov answer for it personally himself. Perhaps he will then rectify some things in the plan, on the basis, at least, of the debate we've held. One should not hide behind anonymity, behind the Politburo, the Central Committee, the Supreme Soviet, and behind the Congress of People's Deputies any more. Those days are gone. The country must know who its heroes are, both in the good and the not very good sense. [applause]

Ryzhkov's 'Final' Speech

PM1812105789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

["Final Speech by N.I. Ryzhkov at the Second Congress of USSR's People's Deputies."]

[Text] Comrade people's deputies! Instead of a final speech, I had planned to answer the questions which came in during discussion of the USSR Government's report, but they are continuing to come in. I propose that I give answers to the rest in the course of the subsequent work of the Congress. If necessary, we could choose separately a time where I might dwell on them in detail. Therefore, I will start by saying that we expected diverse reactions on the program of measures proposed by the USSR Council of Ministers to improve the state of the economy, and to the concept and stages of the economic reform and the fundamental approaches to the 13th 5-year plan period. Therefore, I express the following thoughts.

First and foremost, we are grateful to all the people's deputies who, in one form or another, have expressed their observations, proposals, and desires on the material presented by the USSR Government. They all come within the framework of the constructive and extremely important conversation which has taken place at the congress during these days, and they have brought much that is useful for further work on the problems facing our country. I do not want to get into polemics on any specific proposals or assessments which were given in the course of the discussion of this key issue for the development of the country's economy and the whole of our society. Neither the time allotted for my speech, nor the great diversity of opinions expressed at the joint session of the congress and in the course of the work of its sections, permits me to do that. There is also much which has still to be assessed and considered over and over again. At the same time, I will try to express my overall point of view on just a small number of issues—principally, on how to proceed toward a healthy economy.

A comprehensive evaluation which has been conducted on what was proposed by some people's deputies regarding a transition to market relations from as soon as next year, or the wide use of adminstrative methods of management in all spheres of the national economy, has shown that, if we agree with them, we will have to renounce the stages in which the economic reform is to be carried out, and also a number of its main provisions. I think that the line aimed at making consistent and persistent progress toward a normally functioning economy which does not require the use of those or other such measures, proceeds through improving the state of the national economy in 1990 to 1992, with the active diplacement of administrative methods of management by economic ones during that period, and the transition to wide use of market relations in the second half of the quinquennium. This government stance coincides, in the main, with the majority of proposals and remarks made by people's deputies. At the same time, there are differences connected with the timescale for carrying out the proposed measures and for shifting it in the direction of bringing it closer to 1990 or to the end of the 13th 5-year plan period.

I think that the true situation that has arisen in the economy and in the state as a whole gives us the right to insist upon the option that has been put forward by the USSR Council of Ministers, and to reject resolutely the use of the shock therapy method proposed by some people in order to get out of the extremely complex situation, something which could cost the people very dearly.

In this connection I repeat what was said in the report. We cannot move forward either by means of small, partial improvements to the economic mechanism, spread out over a period of time, or by rushing into the deep waters of the market elements immediately and without circumspection, without creating the necessary conditions and effective regulators. It is our firm conviction that here there is neither the conservatism of which they try ever more loudly to accuse us, nor the ultra-left radicalism toward which some people are insistently trying to pull us.

Several times the thought that the reform is allegedly being put off for 3 years crept in during the process of the discussion of the program. I have to state quite definitely that the reform is not being suspended and is not being put off. On the contrary, these years will be filled with energetic preparations and with carrying out measures in resolutely deepening it.

Now about the measures for improving the economy. We considered once again whether there was a need for everything that has been mapped out for 1990 to be shown in detail in the report presented for the consideration of the congress. We came to the conclusion that this demand by a number of people's deputies was fully in order, and could be implemented. However, taking into consideration the fact that the plan for the country's social and economic development for the coming year has been examined in all committees and commissions of the Supreme Soviet from all sides and in detail; that it has been discussed carefully at the USSR Supreme Soviet session, with the participation of all union republics, has been confirmed and has become law, it would hardly be expedient to discuss its provisions once again, this time at the level of the congress. This is what guided us in preparing the draft report. As far as the practicability of the achievement of the objectives envisaged in it, and the fulfilment of the tasks for 1990 that spring from them, in my view, the discussion about this at the congress was very constructive and principled. Here, too, however, the opinions were not straightforward. This is evidence of the fact that the next year is an unusual year. Some extremely busy work lies ahead, and it will indeed be that year which will determine the practicability of starting the changes in the economy.

If, then, one is to talk overall about the measures for improving the national economy during the years 1990-92; about the rightfulness of preserving administrative methods of management within certain limits for this period; and also about the fact that the temptation to extend these over the whole of the 13th 5-year plan period might make its appearance; then one can say the following: Fulfillment of the program that has been mapped out for those years is the guarantee that we will move away from those principles, precisely because these 3 years, which in their importance are equal to the enormous tasks which face us, will be extremely complicated. But the fulfillment of these tasks is realistic. It depends upon the effectiveness of the whole of our work.

I would like to make individual mention of a matter which has evoked a very acute polemic, both at the plenary sitting of the congress and during the work of the sections. This concerns a very important aspect of improving the economy—the balance of materials and, in the first place, the state order. Just as happened before, diametrically opposed opinions continue to be expressed on this subject.

Some people think that everything should be allocated, and that a state order should be set for everything; in support of this they say that the first experience of granting enterprises broad autonomy, without the corresponding mechanisms of economic and legal regulation, and the absence of conditions for the efficient functioning of wholesale trade, have led to disjunction, to intensification of the disbalance in the national economy, to disruption of established links, and to direct goods exchange. Other people demand a decisive renunciation of the state order and call for everything be transferred exclusively to direct links and market relations.

While giving all of this continual consideration, the government considers that the program and approaches which have been proposed with regard to the state order in 1990-92, with its constant reduction, and the transfer to wholesale trade and to a market in consumer goods and means of production, are the correct ones, and asks the congress to support these proposals.

Some comrades try to represent these actions for transferring to the market as uncertainty on the part of the government, but one should not lose sight of the realities of life. The transfer within the economy to market relations should take place step by step, while maintaining a certain sequence of steps. It seems that the past few years have allowed us to accumulate experience, and on the basis of this to elaborate an approach to this problem which has been comprehensively thought-out, although in this case we stil have very seriously and basically to smooth out all of this complicated mechanism.

Finally, on the subject of the principled approaches to drawing up the 13th 5-year plan: It is most likely that the program did not fully manage to express precisely the essence of the forecasting evaluations in close connection with the new economic and legal principles which will form the bases for drawing up the 5-year plan, and in the first instance, in connection with the transfer of the union republics to self-financing and self-governing, the development of varied forms of ownership and economic management and the delegation of rights from the center to the localities. However, I must say that in my view, any government, in any country, particularly in ours, in order to provide purposeful regulation of the economic development of society, should forecast, carry out comprehensive and deep analysis, and measure, not just seven times but a 100 times, on the basis of multivariant, multialternative approaches, the possibilities for further progress, and only then make real practical steps. Otherwise, if precise aims are lacking, one might step into the void of lack of coordination among resources, of disbalance in the economy, and of inflation.

But the main thing is that Soviet people will not be able to understand what awaits them in the next few years. The question, therefore, is not just about forecasts and objectives, but about the ways and methods that are to be used to achieve them. This, in our view, is the main thing. In order to substantiate this point of view I will say that the forthcoming 5-year plan, or more precisely, the approaches toward its formation, are based upon the fact that everything that is old and formerly inherent in the planned regulation of the economy has to be changed radically. This is a major task pertaining to the whole state, and one of the main strategic objectives.

If I am to sum up some of the results of the discussion of the government's approaches to the formation of the 13th 5-year plan in broad terms, then the following can be singled out: The forthcoming 5-year period is of key significance for overcoming the extremely complicated state of the economy, and for creating a qualitatively new economic system. I would like to draw your attention to the fact that approaches that are new in principle to the formation of the 13th 5-year plan have been proposed to the congress. Approaches, that is, and not the 5-year plan itself. At the same time the speeches of many people's deputies contained many specific proposals concerning investment, deliveries of equipment, new construction projects, volumes of production of output, and others. We understand that they are all based upon a real foundation and are dictated by life. But what we are talking about now is something else: The approaches to the formation of the 5-year plan. If they are approved by the congress, then specific work on preparing the 5-year plan upon the basis of the projections of the enterprises, the regions, the union republics, the industries and the national economic complexes, will unfold. In this connection the USSR Council of Ministers asks the congress to support its stance on the necessity for forecasting assessments proposed as landmarks that can be used by enterprises, union republics, ministries and departments in their specific work on the projections of the next 5-year plan.

We understand clearly that under conditions where new economic laws on ownership, land, republican self-management and self- financing, local enterprise and local self-government, a single taxation system and the socialist enterprise are in operation, the appearance and the parameters of the 5-year plan will of course be determined in a new way. The government asks the Supreme Soviet to examine and to adopt these laws, without postponement, at the beginning of 1990.

Further, the formation of the 5-year plan must be based upon program and goal-orientated planning methods, taking into account the radically changing interrelationships between the center and the union republics, and also the organs of power locally, their changeover to principles of self-management and self-financing, and the wide use of economic regulators under the new conditions of economic management.

These, very briefly, are our thoughts on the most fundamental points concerning each section of the government's report to the Congress of People's Deputies. In conclusion I want to stress once more that a constructive and very useful discussion took place at the Congress. During the discussion of the government's proposals quite a few interesting ideas, critical remarks, more precise definitions and wishes were expressed. At the same time, the position of certain deputies, especially of the interregional group, which expresses distrust in the program, was heard at the congress. Again it is proposing that the decision of fundamental questions be postponed for an indefinite time. I think that this is not fortuitous, because not to make the decision today will mean, in essence, to reject a well-defined policy of action. All this of course will not be to the benefit of a stabilization of the situation in the country. I understand that the government's program is not without its shortcomings, but it takes into account our realistic possibilities to the maximum degree, the stages of our progress, and sets guidelines for the future. The USSR Council of Ministers considers that the country today needs this program of action. Of course, it will be enriched and supplemented in the course of its implementation, taking into account also the diversity of all the ideas, thoughts and proposals that have been mentioned here. At the same time it is quite obvious that the trust of the people's deputies and the trust of the whole of society are required for the fulfillment of any program.

I ask the congress to support the program of the government of the country. Lastly, as regards the anonymity of the programm: for the information of Comrade deputy Arbatov, my signature is on it. I do not deny my signature. I have never used anyone as a cover. It is a matter not of what the program is called, but of its essence and practicability, and I recognize fully my responsibility. Thank you. [Applause]

Ryzhkov Discusses Economic Program

LD1612114889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0927 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—By a TASS parliamentary correspondent:

"I believe in the success of my government and think that, despite criticism of its proposals, that fact that we have the specific program of action is positive," Soviet Prime Minister Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov told TASS on Saturday.

Commenting on the debate on the government program to revitalize the economy at the Second Congress of the USSR People's Deputies, he said that the government clearly formulated its approaches to economic problems and defined stages and datelines for their solution. The implementation of this program, which presupposes a normal economic situation in the country, depends on society on the whole.

"It will be unrealistic if we work as badly as in this year," Ryzhkov stressed.

The Soviet prime minister said the goal of the Council of Ministers was to facilitate the fulfillment of this program through a variety of methods—economic, legal and administrative.

During the current debates, Ryzhkov said, "nothing is said about the need to tackle many problems locally, while fresh demands are made of the central government. Generally speaking, there has not been a serious turn to self-management."

Speaking about his attitude to speeches at the Congress by Deputies Boris Yeltsin and Gavril Popov, Ryzhkov said that he did not see any constructive proposals in them. He believes that these speeches contained many general phrases and contradictions.

"It is not a program when one demands introducing immediately rationing and after several phrases speaks about the need for a saturated market," Ryzhkov stressed.

He also disagreed with the proposals to endorse laws on property and land. Nikolay Ryzhkov is convinced that at such a forum it is possible only to adopt decisions of principle and that specific laws are a matter for parliament.

Speaking about criticism often heard at the congress, Ryzhkov said that perhaps life itself leads to such a keen and, sometimes irreconcilable, discussion.

"I am distressed that sometimes only unbridled criticism is heard without any constructive proposals. As for myself, agrarian deputies even declared that I am an enemy of agriculture. I am leaving this to the conscience of these people and firmly reject such statements."

Asked what will happen if the congress does not endorse the government's proposal, the prime minister said: "This is not only my program, although it is called the Ryzhkov program. If it is not approved, then other people should elaborate another program."

Comments on Economic Debate

LD1612170689 Moscow World Service in English 1510 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Interview with USSR Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov by correspondent Boris Markovnikov during an interval at the Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 16 December—recorded; Ryzhkov speaks in Russian with superimposed Engish translation]

[Text] There have been heated debates at the Congress of People's Deputies, under way in Moscow, over the program advanced by the government to improve the economy and to carry out an economic reform stage by stage. Actually, the destiny of perestroyka and its economic foundation depend on that. Some 150 deputies have already taken the floor. A great many of them support the program, say it is well-balanced, and its measures are consistent to enable our vast economy to convert to market relations. But far from all deputies feel like that. Much criticism has been voiced both at full-scale sittings of the congress and at the meeting of its sections. In a break between the sittings of the Congress of People's Deputies our parliamentary correspondent, Boris Markovnikov, talked to the Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov. How does the prime minister regard the debates since he also became a target of criticism?

[Answer] Nikolay Ryzhkov says that the discussion is diversified with views being at times irreconcilable. Apparently life is such today that it dictates exactly extreme judgements. Of course this is hard to bear. I am outraged, says Nikolay Ryzhkov, at times that there is only continued criticism and no constructive proposals are made. We should all avoid criticism for its own sake. As for me personally, yes there has been criticism indeed, right in my face for one, by a farm expert, as if I'm one of the people who slowed down or couldn't care less about agriculture. I believe, continues the Soviet prime minister, that the critics have to realize this. I flatly reject their summary accusations. In the past 4 years in office I've been always trying and have been turning around the entire Cabinet toward the agrarian matters. I've said again and again that if we could solve agricultural matters now 70 percent of our countries problems would have been settled. One has to be a short-sighted politician or (?person) to act as a break where he knows where society's painful spot is. I categorically reject these accusations, (?said) the Soviet prime minister.

[Question] Some of the speakers in the debate have expressed doubt that this extensive program was realistic. Does the prime minister believe it can succeed?

[Answer] Yes, I believe in it, replies Nikolay Ryzhkov. With all the criticism we hear I think it's a positive fact that we have such a program. Two years ago we had just a general conception of economic restructuring. Now we propose specific measures. We have defined separate stages and set the dates. I feel that the deputies and all our society should appreciate that. The government program is certainly open to criticism and I dare say it deserves it. But mind you, that's a program of action. It will depend on us how well we can fulfil it. If we go on working as badly as this year we can hardly do it. We need another attitude. The program requires a normal working situation in the country. Government should create that situation through economic, legal, and administrative measures. If some people expect the government to do the whole job alone that's only false hope. Have you noticed that nobody talks today about the local republican governments (?or that) many issues must be tackled by them? That approach has no prospects. That would only mean staying in the old rut if you say you are the center, you decide everything, and you must do it all.

[Question] Our correspondent asked Nikolay Ryzhkov the following question: You said many times that you were for constructive criticism. Can you see any such constructive criticism coming from Boris Yeltsin or Gavril Popov? Boris Yeltsin, for instance, called on the deputies to refrain from adopting your program.

[Answer] No, I don't think Yeltsin has any constructive proposals. What he says is just common knowledge. Besides, he has contradictions. He calls for imposing (?rations) throughout the country and in the same breath he demands the full freedom for the market forces. Is that not too serious?

[Question] The final question to Nikolay Ryzhkov was: What if the congress rejects your program?

[Answer] That's not my program although it is referred to as the Ryzhkov program. That's the government's program though I am one of its authors. If that's rejected then other people should draw up another program, Nikolay Ryzhkov said in conclusion.

Expresses Commitment to Program

PM1612213289 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA political observer S. Karkhanin, on 16 December after Ryzhkov's speech at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, under the rubric "Interview After the Session": "Vector of Stability"—first paragraph is SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA introduction]

[Text] The debates on the government report ended at the Congress on Saturday, and now the USSR People's Deputies have to adopt a resolution. What form will it take? The effectiveness of the economic reform depends largely on this. The position of the USSR Council of Ministers is the subject of an interview given by N.I. Ryzhkov to SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's political observer after his speech.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, more and more often here at the congress one hears people saying that there is no unity in the government leadership on the approach to the concept of reform, and there is much talk of "unfulfilled expectations." The polemics here at the congress have demonstrated the diversity of the deputies' opinions. Would you comment on that?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, one can perceive a certain line aimed at driving a wedge between Ryzhkov, who is supposedly more conservative, and Abalkin and other members of the Council of Ministers Presidium. But the document represents our collective work, we discussed it for several months, calculating, considering, and thinking about all the options. I have already said to Academician G.A. Arbatov today, and I am prepared to repeat it: My signature is on the document, and I am prepared to answer for it.

Order must be imposed in the country, and both economic and administrative measures must be used. It is no secret that economic levers are not working as they should, leveling still flourishes. But if the country chooses the path we have proposed, it will be possible to impose order.

Take the state order, again. Last year, by giving way to public opinion, we made a mistake. It turns out that the machine builder receives a 25-percent state order, and the oilman 95 percent. But how can you extract oil if you do not have enough machinery? So beginning in 1991, we want to follow a different system for two years: 90 percent for everyone. We will create a market from the remaining 10 percent, although that will be very difficult. That 10 percent will not go where one would wish.... But the combination of administrative and economic measures will eventually produce results.

[Karkhanin] You are doubtless aware of people's dissatisfaction with the "freezing" of wages. It is indeed hard to relate this to the course of improving people's living standard....

[Ryzhkov] In November the growth in incomes reached 13 percent, while the production of output increased by 0.6 percent.... So how can we balance out the market? No economy can stand that! Commodity turnover in the first 11 months of the year was 10 percent up, we have never seen anything like it! All kinds of rumors and instability in society lead to a situation where people are sweeping everything off the shelves without stopping to think whether or not they need a particular product. Of course, those who have a fixed income do not have this growth in income. But there is a certain group of people who do.

[Karkhanin] How do you assess Academician G.A. Arbatov's speech, which made a very great impact?

[Ryzhkov] At the CPSU Central Committee plenum, as a member of the Politburo I reported on the program proposed by the government. I think the plenum participants acted correctly by expressing their attitude to it and supporting our concept. But Comrade Arbatov was sitting there, too! Why did he not get up? He could have said: Comrade Ryzhkov, I do not support your program. But he did not say it! He has only spoken out here. I do not think that is correct behavior. Why he did such a thing, I do not know.

[Karkhanin] Nikolay Ivanovich, the problem of discipline now affects not only plan commitments, but also the work of every individual at his place of work. How can we rid ourselves of disorderliness, thriftlessness, and useless time-wasting in production?

[Ryzhkov] We must look for ways, take a tougher line. Of course, no one is going to dismiss people now for being five minutes late. But if you do not work, you should always remember, you should go. I think we have forgotten that.

[Karkhanin] What about the underground millionaires, rumors of which cause people to get so excited?

[Ryzhkov] The other day I answered this question to the people's deputies. According to the Ministry of Finance's figures, the maximum financial investment recorded in the Soviet Union is R200,000. But I must say this. You remember the much-publicized story of Artem Tarasov, who made 3 million? I thought society would take a very negative attitude to that. But all at once people started praising him, extolling him.... Who extolled him, me? No, the press. So is that our "ideology" today? Come on, lads, earn a few million and you will be leaders of organizations of some kind.

Incidentally, do you know how much some candidates spent on their campaign for election as people's deputies? R80,000 each. Out of 3 million, you could easily "part with" 80,000....

[Karkhanin] Are you confident that the congress will support your program?

[Ryzhkov] I cannot speak for the deputies. Especially since I sense that the mood of the auditorium is changing very rapidly. It is like waves passing through. First rejection, then support. I think there is still a good deal of emotion.

[Karkhanin] What if the program does not meet with the support of the congress?

[Ryzhkov] Others will draw up a new program. Then it will not be Ryzhkov mounting the platform, but someone else. I am answerable for my program, and I believe in it. I will never repudiate what I have signed. If I were afraid, I would have no business being in government.

16 Dec Economic Debate Detailed

LD1612135389 Moscow TASS in English 1314 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

Today the participants in the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies continued discussing the government's programme of economic revitalisation, which started on Wednesday. The debate again revealed that the government concept has both proponents and opponents, from the right and the left.

Chairman of the Executive Council of the Krasnodar Territorial Soviet (Southern Russia), Nikolay Kondratenko, believes that the government tiptoes the line of those economists who "attempt not to adjust market relations to our economy but to push the country onto the capitalist way of development." The deputy called the idea of regional cost-accounting "the lever of splitting the state and our multinational federation."

Ravmer Khabibullin, a party leader from Bashkiria, called for strict measures. "The way out of crisis lies through organisation and intense creative work," he said. "Our electors justly demand that an end should be put to anarchy and law invoked against those who infringe upon the foundations of our system."

Economist Gennadiy Filshin, from Irkutsk (Eastern Siberia), holds a different view. He is convinced that the government tries to get out of the crisis through old methods. The deputy believes that the state bank should be removed from government control in order to cut down inflation, which has recently intensified in the country.

The speaker suggested that the government work out fundamentally new measures to revitalise the economy in a strictly limited period of time. "If the same measures are offered again, we should hold a no-confidence vote and the government tender its resignation," he said.

Leningrad Communist Party chief Boris Gidaspov said that nobody could come up with a real alternative to the government programme. At the same time, he believes, the programme lacks a clear-cut approach towards creating the regulation mechanism.

"A search for the optimum combination of state regulation and the self-management of labour collectives is the cornerstone of the problem at the current stage," the deputy said. "We should not release the levers of state regulation until all the objective conditions have been created."

The view of military circles was expressed by Chief of Staff of the USSR Armed Forces Mikhail Moiseyev. Having supported the concept of economic development on the whole, he dwelt on the problem of conversation. Without objecting in principle, Moiseyev said at the same time that conversation of the defence industry to consumer goods production, which does not demand high level of technology, "will damage the scientific-technological potential and hamper scientific developments."

Moiseyev described the national-territorial military formations, which are advocated by some republics and mass organisations, as an acute problem of the armed forces development. The chief of staff is convinced that further qualitative development of the Armed Forces should be based on the existing principles of their formation. He said the modern Armed Forces—the Strategic Rocket Forces, the Navy and Air Force—cannot be organised, equipped, manned and trained by a single republic.

Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Academy of Sciences' Institute of the U.S. and Canada favoured a major cut in defence spending. Numerous costly military progammes, adopted in the past years, and military squandering have "bled white the Soviet economy", the deputy said.

"Without radical cuts in military spending we will hardly be able to stop the economy from lagging behind further," the deputy commented. Conversion of the defence industry has a great potential for speeding up the movement ahead and it should be used in full.

Another reserve of economic development is the new possibilities which opened up in the field of foreign economic ties. Without active involvement in the international division of labour a country, which does not want to lag behind, cannot live and develop in a normal way, the academician stressed. He criticised the government for the lack of well-considered policy which led foreign partners to lose trust in the country.

On the government report, Arbatov said it should not be approved because it raises too many doubts. However other speakers did not support him.

The chairman announced that in four days of debates 162 people, including 112 peole in sections, spoke on the government programme. A decision was taken to close debates.

The congress is expected to vote on the government programme later today.

Leningrad's Gidaspov Interviewed at Congress

LD1612181589 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Interview with Leningrad People's Deputy Boris Gidaspov by parliamentary correspondent Maksim Tkachenko at the Congress of People's Deputies session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow; date not given—recorded; Gidaspov and Tkachenko speak in Russian with superimposed English translation]

[Text] The new leader of the Leningrad Communist Party organization and People's Deputy Boris Gidaspov has said in his exclusive interview for our parliamentary correspondent, Maksim Tkachenko, that the government suggested economy improving measures provide for an excessive use of administrative regulation which, however, he views as a forced and temporary policy. At the same time, Gidaspov censured the government's intention to continue rigid economic planning which, he said, is a priority doomed to failure. The Leningrad party leader seemed to have differences also with the more radically-minded deputies who have been pressing for the immediate introduction of market relations.

[Gidaspov] I do realize that we will come to a market system sooner or later. But as a former head manager of a large industrial plant I can say with confidence that a sudden shift toward purely economic methods of management and hence chaotic market relations is very dangerous. I think a shift of that kind is inadmissible. My view is that if an industry or a factory are fully prepared for a transition to market relations they should immediately be granted all rights and made economically independent. But if they are unprepared for that they will collapse, causing a real tragedy to the local workers and their families.

[Tkachenko] Heated debates going around the government's economic program concern specifically the expediency of transferring medium-sized and large industrial facilities to private interests. Many economists suggest giving private property a status equal to that of government and cooperative property so that there can be an additional incentive to economic development. One of the versions of the draft property law, prepared by parliament and submitted for a nationwide discussion, describes that measure as feasible. But as follows from the ongoing parliamentary debates, the road to full-fledged private property is so far blocked by various ideological barriers with some of the deputies dismissing the whole idea as signalling a departure from socialism. Boris Gidaspov places a special accent on the fact that the measures have won no large scale support from the nation.

[Gidaspov] Personally, I've nothing against private property. If some people are ready for it let them have it. But over the past month a mere 28 personal farms have emerged in Leningrad region with the vast majority of the agricultural workers unwilling to leave large collectives farms. If I'm told that there are at least 1 million people willing to buy personal land plots, that'll be something to talk about. Instead of teaching people to work with due efficiency, we waste time discussing private property.

[Tkachenko] Another topic for heated discussion both at the congress and by the general public has been Article 6 of the national Constitution which gives the Communist Party a leading role in society. Parliament has decided by a slim majority of votes against debating the issue at the congress. But the question consists not so much in the need to abolish the controversial article which one may be sure will be done in the relatively near future as in when and how to begin working in that direction. Boris Gidaspov again:

[Gidaspov] I am against Article 6. The platform of the Leningrad Communists unequivocally states that we are against the declarative promotion of the party's leading role. But when it came down to deciding whether or not the article should be discussed by the congress I voted against it. I object to removing one article from the Constitution which must be reviewed as a whole. There's also Article 2 which stipulates that all power in this country belongs to the soviets, which is a questionable statement. There is Article 51 concerning political organizations in the USSR which too needs rewording and being brought in line with the realities of perestroyka. Thus, as a Leningrad Communist I'm against Article 6. But as a USSR people's deputy I'm for a general revision of the national Constitution.

Most Deputies Reportedly Support Gradual Change

LD1612074489 Moscow TASS in English 0739 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which opened in Moscow on Tuesday, today continued the discussion of the government-presented economic recovery programme, the key issue on the Congress agenda.

The previous four days of debates have revealed two major positions. The government's opponents describe the programme of action as too timid and insist on an early introduction of a free market, the revival of private property and denationalisation of at least some industries.

However, the bigger part of deputies display a more balanced approach. Although criticising some theses of the governmental programme, they support the principle of reasonable graduality, capable of preventing a social upheaval.

The government's urgent measures for the period until 1992 are also received with understanding.

The discussion of the governmental report is expected to be completed by this afternoon.

Congress Debates Constitutional Amendments

LD1612121689 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies at its afternoon sesion began to consider next item on the agenda—changes of the Soviet Constitution's articles concerning elections to republican and local government bodies.

A report on this subject is being delivered by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet (a summary of the report will be run as a separate item).

In December 1988 the Soviet parliament adopted amendments to the Constitution that made it possible to hold elections to the Soviet supreme forum on a democratic basis.

This time articles specifiying a procedure for elections to republican parliaments and local government bodies are expected to be changed in a similar way.

Lukyanov Reports on Electoral System Changes

PM1812125589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition pp 2-3

[Text] Moscow, 16 Dec—Esteemed comrade deputies!

The atmosphere of debate and polemics, the foundations of which were laid by our first congress, and which has been reinforced by two sessions of the Supreme Soviet, seems to be becoming a tradition that can only be welcomed. But no matter how irreconcilable the points of view expressed from this rostrum may be at times, we probably have every reason to believe that movement has begun concerning two key reforms—economic reform and political reform. We already have results. They may be early ones, and they may be modest ones, but they are no less long-awaited for that.

And if Marx' notion that an "idea" has always been discredited when it has become separated from "interests" is correct, then the fact that the process of renewal is bringing the idea of perestroyka ever-closer to the interest of millions and millions of people can be viewed as equally correct. In the course of this process, the lawmaking activity of the supreme bodies of state power is becoming increasingly weighty. Much has already been said about that in recent days.

The draft USSR law on changes and additions to the USSR Constitution on issues relating to the electoral system, which has been put forward for your examination, is the realization of a direct instruction from the First Congress of People's Deputies.

Objectively, the situation is such that with the adoption of this crucial act, the country is tackling one of the key tasks of the second stage of political reform, in the course of which a new system of organs of power in republics, krays, oblasts, towns, and rural localities is to be created. The practical progress of perestroyka depends to an enormous extent on the successful functioning of this most mass level of Soviet power, on how it fits into the general system of people's power, and on how it will begin operating.

The experience of the March elections of USSR people's deputies showed convincingly that despite all the inevitable shortcomings in such a pioneering matter, those elections are, at least up to the present, without precedent in our practice either for their degree of democratism, glasnost, and political activity on the part of citizens, or for the intensity of the preelection struggle itself. No, not all that was new was positively appraised by public opinion. Yes, in the course of the elections there were shortcomings, but no one can dispute the powerful breakthrough in the electoral practice itself, or raise doubts about the fact that they resulted in the creation of a fundamentally new supreme level of power, which is new with regard to its composition, its functions, the way its work is organized, and, say, with regard to its creative potential.

Does this mean that the coming republican and local elections will automatically be a "repetition of what occurred before?" I think not. It is most likely that the form of Soviet people's power will acquire new features. A new legal basis which relies on the norms of the Union Constitution and takes account not only of the pluses and minuses of the past elections, but also the sharp increase in the social activity of citizens, and the particular features of the present situation in society, is intended to facilitate this.

The CPSU platform on issues of nationalities policy, the principles of decentralization, the strengthening of the sovereign rights of the union republics, and the precise course toward a break with formal unification—all of this has made it possible for the USSR Supreme Soviet, by its decision of 24 October 1989, to give the green light to a radical renewal of republican legislation on elections, and also the acts which determine the system and functions of the organs of state power in the republics and the localities.

At the same time it was deemed possible to introduce appropriate amendments into the republican constitutions, and to adopt new laws on elections even before the corresponding bill on changes and additions to the Union Constitution is confirmed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

What, then, is characteristic of the work that has been done in the localities during this time? How does it tie in with the new constitutional enactments [ustanovleniya]? What specific changes in the basic law of the USSR are we talking about?

The essence of the additions and changes to the Constitution that are being put forward for your consideration consists primarily in the fact that the democratic content of the Soviet electoral system is being noticeably enriched. A diversity of mechanisms for regulating the procedure of the elections is being asserted. The single approach to key questions, which lies at the foundation of the Soviet organisation of power, is acompanied by much more consistent and careful consideration for the specific features of national and local conditions.

All of this is clearly to be seen in the draft bill presented for confirmation by the congress.

In the first place, it is proposed that the excessively rigid definition of the system of supreme representative bodies of state power of the union republics should be removed from the Union Constitution. The new wording of Articles 89 and 91 does not now provide for the obligatory formation of congresses of people's deputies in every union and autonomous republic. This takes into account the public opinion of the republics, which is clearly inclined toward not having a two-link system of supreme bodies of power. The only exception is the Russian Federation, where both a Congress of People's Deputies and a Supreme Soviet will operate. This is understandable if one bears in mind the enormous size and complex national and state structure of this republic.

The new editions of Articles 89 and 145 of the USSR Constitution propose a departure from the standardization in the system of local soviets which exists in each union and autonomous republic. Even now we have, shall we say, soviets for stanitsas, kishlaks, auls and apilins [all types of villages]. In some places the need arises to form national rayons and nation rural soviets. The new constitution is intended to facilitate this, strengthening the republics' sovereignty. It proceeds from life itself, from its practical requirements.

Attention is being given to a possible variation in methods of forming soviet presidiums in the republics. Concerning this, it is intended to render Article 91 of the USSR Constitution more precisely. In some republics, by analogy with the union organ, the presidiums will be established from among the officials listed in the Constitution. This principle is now envisaged in, shall we say, the Russian Federation. But in the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] and the Kirghizian SSR, for example, it is being combined with the possible election to the Presidium of other persons. Nor is the variant excluded whereby the Presidium's full complement will be elected by the Supreme Soviet. This is why the new edition of Article 91 of the Union Constitution uses the generalized term "the presidiums are formed"; its specific meaning will be provided by each republic's constitution.

Articles 138 and 144 of the USSR Constitution propose a move away from an excessively detailed exposition of the provisions which define the position and role of the supreme organs of state power and administration in the union and autonomous republics.

There will remain here only the most general norms to be taken as a starting point. In this way, wider possibilities for the independent solution of the aforementioned issues are opening up before the republics.

When speaking of this block of constitutional innovations, one must obviously note that the exclusion from the basic law of the USSR of any mention of congresses of peoples deputies as an obligatory element of the supreme link of power of the union republics does not, of course, mean that the very idea of congresses is being cast into doubt. The implementation of this idea in practice, the creation of a two-unit supreme body of power in the shape of the Congress and Supreme Soviet of the USSR indicates a realistic way, and one which has already justified itself, to link broad popular representation with the permanent implementation of legislative, organizing, and control functions. In creating their own structure of power, distinct from the union one, the republics will be able, in case of need, to turn also to these general principles of the construction of a Soviet form of the sovereignty of the people, and of drawing from them what they find necessary.

As you know, the USSR Supreme Soviet discussed comprehensively the question of the direct representation of public organizations in the supreme bodies of state power. This discussion was quite sharp. As a result, it was decided to drop from Article 95 of the USSR Constitution the second part containing the instruction about the possibility of electing people's deputies directly from public organizations. It was deemed expedient to hold elections for people's deputies only according to constituencies in which public groups will take part as they did before. The only exceptions in this regard are the Kazakh SSR, in the Supreme Soviet of which the direct representation of public organizations is envisaged, and the Belorussian SSR, where 50 out of 360 mandates are allocated to local organizations of war and labor veterans, and societies of invalids, the blind, and the deaf.

In view of these changes, reference to elections from public organizations is dropped in articles 95, 96, 97 and 98 of the USSR Constitution. Concerning the constitution's norms for the composition of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, they are retained in full. And that means that the powers of USSR people's deputies of the current convocation, who were elected from public organizations, are not placed in any doubt whatsoever.

In discussions at the USSR Supreme Soviet there was no support for the proposal to establish the post of president of a republic, or chairman of a Soviet, to be directly elected by the population, apart from the supreme or local Soviet. The point here, of course, is not in the title, not in a term which would be new to us. It is not in the formal side, but in the essence of the issue. Direct election of a soviet chairman by the population and the establishment of presidential power in a republic would mean the emergence of an official figure who would be virtually independent of any representative body, and that would contradict the very idea of the sovereignty of the soviets and the united principles of their structure and functioning. Let me remind you that there were major arguments about this back at the 19th party conference, and subsequently at the Congress of People's Deputies, and probably the reasoning and arguments already cited on this score should be heeded.

Constitutional amendments also affect the schedule and procedure for setting elections. As is well known, Article 90 of the All-Union Constitution currently in effect establishes that elections of people's deputies are set no later than 4 months before the term of office of the relevant bodies of state authority expires.

This applies to all levels of the soviets, although it is clear that for many of them such a time limit could perfectly well be different, something which is in fact now set down in the constitutions and the new electoral laws of several republics. In fact, it is proposed that the Union Constitution should keep the instruction for a 4-month limit only for elections of USSR people's deputies.

The question of the fate of constituency electoral meetings has been actively discussed by the public. The majority of the republics, with the exception of the Turkmen SSR, have rejected this institution. The Uzbek, Kazakh, and Kirghiz SSR's envisage holding conferences of the electors of a constituency, and these are being given the right to make decisions on presenting candidate people's deputies for registration to the relevant electoral commissions. In order to not tie down the republics within some kind of frameworks, the USSR Supreme Soviet proposes dropping entirely from Article 100 of the Union Constitution the clause on these meetings. In this way, in solving this question, the republics will now have complete autonomy.

It has been deemed expedient to take one more step aimed at expanding the possibilities for young people to take part in the holding of elections. With this aim it is proposed, in articles 100 and 101 of the USSR Constitution, to give collectives from secondary, special, and higher educational establishments the right to nominate candidates for people's deputy, and to guarantee their participation in electoral commissions and in preelectoral agitation. This norm has now been set down in the constitutions of the union and autonomous republics.

During the discussion of the proposed amendments, several deputies expressed the opinion that a rule should be added to Article 100 of the Constitution, under which the number of candidates included on voting papers must exceed the number of available deputies' seats. A majority of those taking part in the discussion, however, disagreed with this point of view, and came out in favor of not restricting the right of the voters to decide for themselves the issue of the number of candidatures included in the voting paper. With due consideration for this, the existing norm on the possibility of including any number of candidates on the voting paper has been retained in the text of the USSR Constitution. In the opinion of a majority of members of the Supreme Soviet, it is more democratic.

The elections which took place in March showed the need to add to the Union Constitution a provision, new in principle, directed at ensuring for all candidate people's deputies equal opportunities for taking part in the election campaign. It is known that in practice not infrequently it is not a candidate's personal qualities, but the extent to which his election campaign has been supplied with propaganda and material and technical facilities that has become the decisive factor in victory or defeat in elections. "Unilateral advantages" of this kind in no way accord with the principles of socialist democracy and social justice. In consideration of this, it is proposed that a provision be included in Article 100 of the USSR Constitution enabling an electoral comission to make expenditures connected with the preparation and holding of elections from a single fund created at the expense of the state, enterprises, public, and other organizations. Such an approach is intended to ensure equal "starting positions" for every candidate people's deputy.

And one further question. It concerns the restriction provided for under Article 91, which stipulates that individuals elected or appointed by soviets are able to hold their posts for no more than two terms.

That is undoubtedly a necessary principle. At the same time, taking the specific nature of judicial operations and the increased guarantees of the independence of the judges into consideration, the proposal not to extend this rule to them has been included in the draft, and the appropriate proviso has been stated in Article 91.

That, comrades, is a brief account of the "package" of changes and additions presented to the congress for introduction into the USSR Constitution. They are the accumulation of the norms that have been formulated by union and autonomous republics, and they summarize the common approaches applied by republican legislators. The result is a sort of interpenetration, a mutual enrichment of union and republican legislation which is in accordance with the principles of our federation. The USSR relies on the lawmaking of the republics, while the republics, in turn, use as their starting point the fundamental principles of the Union Constitution.

I should say that representatives of all union republics, many USSR people's deputies, chairmen of Supreme Soviet committees and of the commissions of its chambers, as well as leading academic experts on matters of state, took part in the elaboration of the draft law which we are to examine. Questions of reviewing electoral legislation were discussed at a special conference of chairmen of presidiums of supreme soviets of union and autonomous republics. The draft law was carefully examined at a session of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and subsequently, after thorough and constructive discussion, during which each amendment was subjected to comprehensive appraisal, it was approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet and put forward for your examination.

It is natural that, in perfecting constitutional norms concerning elections, the Supreme Soviet could not pass over a wider range of issues connected with changing several other provisions of the basic law now in force, and also with the formulation of a new Union Constitution as a whole.

For the adoption of the new standing orders, the law on the status of people's deputies and the law on constitutional supervision also presupposes that certain more precise definitions will be incorporated into the norms of the Constitution. Thus we are "repairing," as it were, the corresponding chapters of the Union Constitution, moving forward along the road of constitutional reform.

What is taking place now, one might say, is the turning out of ideas, the accumulation of conceptual political and legal "work in hand," which in the long term is due to make up the content of the new USSR Constitution.

This was discussed at a recent sitting of the Constitutional Commission, formed by the First Congress of People's Deputies. Defining an approach of principle to the problems of working out this document, the commission came to the conclusion that at the present stage of perestroyka, when an answer still must be given to many, many questions, and when very complex processes in the life of society and the state are at the stage of coming into being, the hasty adoption of a new Constitution could merely serve to damage both its content and its authority. And this is understandable. For indeed, it is impossible to create the kind of foundation-laying political and juridical document like that of the Constitution until the mechanisms for solving the whole set of tasks of an economic, social and spiritual character that face society take shape in practice. Any attempt to revise the Constitution as a whole by means of a "cavalry charge," like the intention to carry out the all-round correction of all interlinked constitutional provisions, is capable of bringing severe vengeance upon us.

Again and again here we must be realists; as the ancients used to say, we must be able to "make haste slowly."

In particular, this is shown clearly by examination of the proposals that have been put forward repeatedly for changing that chapter of the basic law that secures the principles of the Soviet federation, and of the demarcation of powers between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the union republics. Are these corrections needed? Yes, undoubtedly they are needed. At the same time, it is clear that a revision of this chapter cannot be carried out until laws have been adopted on republican financial autonomy and the economic independence of the republics. The adoption of these laws will in turn require changes to be made not only to the competence of the supreme bodies of state power—the Congress and the Supreme Soviet of the USSR—but also to that of the USSR Council of Ministers, the procurator general, as is being proposed by deputies from Moldavia, and of other union bodies, not to mention substantial change to existing provisions concerning a number of questions of economic and sociocultural development.

Today there are no doubts about the need to change the enactments [ustanovleniya] of the Constitution concerning ownership relationships. As is known, a draft law on ownership in the USSR, and draft fundamentals of USSR and union republic land legislation, which reflect the essence not only of our economic system but of the Soviet social system as a whole, have been submitted for discussion by all the people. It is clear that the reworking of several key provisions of the Constitution will be required for the adoption of these laws.

Besides this, comrades, we cannot fail to take into account the fact that despite intensive work on these drafts in the Supreme Soviet, its committees and commissions, on a number of issues it was not possible to find solutions that satisfied everyone. It is sufficient to remember the discussions about the right of ownership of land and other natural resources.

Possibly, it has not yet been our practice to submit for discussion by all the people not only drafts that have been examined by the Supreme Soviet, but also variants prepared by particular committees, republics or groups of deputies. That is why, if the legislator is to move forward, it is necessary to elicit and assess again and again the economic, political, and social consequences of the proposed solutions, and to make full use of the experience, knowledge and creative potential of the whole of our society.

No less acute is the question of the need for a sound law on the socialist enterprise. But here, too, the point is that the draft law proposed by the government is, in the view of the committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and of the commissions of its chambers, still in need of serious further work. In addition, the experts consider that the starting point for this law must be the general concept of economic reform, which is before our congress for consideration.

Certain divergences from the existing constitutional norms are also found in the draft of the general principles of local self-management and local economy, which has recently been published for universal discussion. In a word, a good few issues of this kind have accumulated, as the discussion at the present session has shown. And let me say bluntly that the Supreme Soviet Presidium is in solidarity with those people's deputies who, showing a sincere interest in deepening perestroyka, urge that laws be passed as soon as possible on all these matters.

What should we do in this situation? Should we wait for the new Constitution to be adopted, or opt for making constitutional changes and passing new laws based on them?

At this point a precedent, which we have already used in connection with the electoral system, comes to our aid, whereby the USSR Supreme Soviet passed the draft of appropriate constitutional amendments on the basis of which the republics have developed legislative work in preparing elections to the republican and local organs of state power. The final ratification at the congress of the constitutional amendments indicated concludes the legal formulation of the changes in the electoral system.

The utilization of this precedent allows us to preserve the stability of the constitution while changing a number of its provisions, and at the same time to direct the gradual renewal of the constitutional area, removing differences between the realities of life and legal norms—as Marx said, between the real and the juridical constitution. At the same time, both at the USSR Supreme Soviet session and during discussions of the agenda of the second congress, the conclusion was made that haste is not needed here, but a normal constitutional process; an all-embracing approach is necessary to the whole gamut of questions, which the constitutional commission created by the first congress is now working on.

As you know, this position of the Supreme Soviet was supported by the December (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, which noted that in striving for the consistent implementation of economic, political, and legal reforms and the transformation of the Soviet federation, the party will assist with all the means at its disposal the realization of the policy not only of introducing the necessary changes into the Constitution of the USSR, but as a result also of creating a new basic law for our country. Within the framework of this process, any constitutional norm can become a subject for rethinking or can be excluded altogether.

This is also fully applicable to Article 6 of the Constitution, which defines the place and role of the Communist Party in the Soviet political system, although that article is today no obstacle either to free elections or to the general deepening of the process of democratizing all aspects of the life of our society.

This is why it is considered desirable that our present session instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet to expedite the passing of laws on ownership, land, the socialist enterprise, the tax system, the general principles of the management of the economy and the social sphere in the union and autonomous republics, delimitation of the powers of the USSR and the union republics, the general principles of local self-management and local economy, and to submit to the next Congress of People's Deputies proposals for introducing the associated amendments into the USSR Constitution.

At the same time, the congress could indicate in its decision that it assumes it will be possible to put these amendments to the constitution into effect even before they are examined by the next Congress of People's Deputies.

The reason I am so definite about this is that in this way we shall fully realize a proposal of many deputies, including the proposal contained in the message from the academic group of deputies that has been distributed today. The group considers that we cannot delay the passing of fundamental laws on ownership, land, the socialist enterprise, and taxation, and that it is necessary to adopt the decision of the second congress on putting these laws into effect as soon as they have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet, without waiting for them to be approved by the Third Congress of People's Deputies.

In addition, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium submits a proposal to adopt a decision of the congress to the effect that the constitutional commission that we have formed should, taking account of the suggestions put forward here by the people's deputies, study in detail the questions of altering a number of proposals contained in Chapters 1 and 2 and in Section III of the existing Constitution, proposals devoted to the foundations of the political and economic system and national/state setup of the USSR.

This would involve supplementing the draft law you have before you, comrade deputies, with two new articles, the text of which has been prepared by the Supreme Soviet Presidium on your instructions. We shall pass this text to the editorial commission.

In forming our approaches to these problems in the spirit of the new political thinking, we must always remember one very simple thing: Each new law brought into life by perestroyka will be a special kind of building material for the creation of the country's new basic law.

We have already embarked upon this work. It will brook neither bustle nor sluggishness. It requires strict fulfillment of Lenin's behest that one must legislate with three-fold circumspection so that the law, born of life, might actively influence life and create more and more new prerequisites for moving socialism forward on the road of its renewal and progress.

The USSR Supreme Soviet asks the Congress to consider the proposals it has drafted.

Primakov Reports on Draft Standing Orders

PM1712190889 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Report delivered by Ye.M. Primakov (chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet ·Soviet of the Union) at 16 December evening session of Second Congress of USSR

People's Deputies: "On the Draft Standing Orders of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] Esteemed comrade deputies!

The significance of the Standing Orders proposed for your consideration lies in the fact that they define the style and forms of work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet. And that will have a considerable influence on the activity of the country's highest legislative bodies in the conditions of perestroyka in all areas of our society's life. Hence the intense interest in the question under review and, I would say, the thoroughness of the work done.

The initial version of the draft Standing Orders, drawn up by legal experts from the Institute of Soviet State Structure and Legislation and the Institute of State and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences, was circulated to all the people's deputies in early August this year.

A large number of observations and proposals came in from deputies, state organs, and scientific institutions. These were examined during the hearings in the Supreme Soviet Committees for Questions of Legislation and for Questions of the Work of Soviets of People's Deputies. Observations were submitted by nearly all the other Supreme Soviet committees and commissions.

After that, the draft Standing Orders were examined twice in November—at the first and second readings—at a joint session of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers, which approved them and instructed amendments to be made in the light of the new proposals and observations from USSR people's deputies, for examination at the Second Congress. This work was done.

The scrupulous work, in numerous stages, on the draft Standing Orders is a further indication that the legislative process in our country has left behind the traditional pattern, whereby draft legislative acts were, as a rule, drawn up outside the Supreme Soviet and submitted to the Supreme Soviet only for voting.

Today, in submitting to the Congress of People's Deputies the draft Standing Orders prepared and approved by the Supreme Soviet, I would like to begin by emphasizing the following.

First, as an important component of the mechanism of a rule-of-law state, the Standing Orders are based on the principles of democracy, glasnost, and true people's power.

Second, the Standing Orders are based on the provisions of the existing USSR Constitution, but a number of constitutional provisions are developed and elaborated in the Standing Orders to take account of perestroyka's renewal of society.

Third, the Standing Orders take into account the experience of the activity of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies, two sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and its committees, commissions, and people's deputies. In other words, they enshrine in legislation the good, positive things that have already emerged in practice. At the same time the Standing Orders take into account existing world experience of parliamentary activity to the extent that it is appropriate to conditions in our country.

Fourth, work on the Standing Orders will not end with their adoption. As world experience, and indeed our own, albeit brief, parliamentary practice, show, perfecting the Standing Orders is a lengthy process, or more correctly, a continuing process.

Allow me to refrain from giving a detailed description of individual sections and articles of the draft law. I hope you have studied its concept and the main provisions, and have tested them to a considerable extent in your own work. In short, you have experienced all the complexity of the procedure for examining questions at the Congress and in the Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions, and have assessed the pros and cons of the draft from that viewpoint too.

The first and most important function of the Standing Orders is to provide a procedural basis for the legislative process, and perhaps the largest number of proposals from deputies were connected with improving that function. Many of them were taken into account in the draft.

First, a number of deputies (Alekseyev, Lubenchenko, Gryazin) believe that work on draft laws should be centered on the committees and commissions. The draft Standing Orders, in their present form, emphasize the decisive role of USSR Supreme Soviet committees and standing commissions of the chambers in the drafting and preliminary examination of draft laws. We have seen for ourselves the effectiveness of this procedure from the example of the USSR Supreme Soviet's work.

The draft Standing Orders also stipulate two readings of a draft law. And the purposes of the first and second readings differ radically. The process of the first reading does not involve a detailed examination of the drafts, but aims to define and establish the basis of the conception of the draft law and to determine the attitude to alternative drafts, if any are submitted.

All the work on amendments and specific observations and proposals from USSR people's deputies on articles of the draft that have been submitted in writing takes place in the committees and commissions prior to the second reading. At this stage, that is, before the second reading, the committees and commissions incorporate agreed amendments and clarifications in the drafts, and provide reasoned explanations to the originators of proposals that are rejected.

The deputies' proposals determine the nature and form of the second reading, which will obviously enable us to make the legislative work of the Supreme Soviet more intensive, better organized, and more effective. At the second reading, the main report at the session of the chambers is delivered by the leading committee, which sums up the opinions of all the committees and commissions. Reports from representatives of other parties are heard only in the event that differences persist. A discussion article by article then begins, during which the opportunity to speak is granted only to the authors of rejected amendments, if they insist on speaking. Thus there will not be a repetition—this time under the television lamps—of a discussion that has already taken place in the committees and commissions.

In defining this procedure for examining draft laws and amendments to them, we took into account the proposals of many deputies (Sobchak, Krayko, Ryabchenko, Timashova, and others).

An important feature of the Standing Orders to which I would like to draw attention is the deputies' enshrined right to pluralism of opinions and the defense of the interests and rights of the minority of deputies. In particular, a special chapter in the draft Standing Orders is devoted to the question of bringing deputies together in standing or ad hoc groups to resolve particular tasks and formulate and uphold particular drafts and platforms. Such associations of deputies are not restricted by national-territorial criteria or membership of a particular social organization.

A number of proposals submitted were aimed at improving the activity of these deputies' groups. The present draft of the Standing Orders takes into account, in particular, the proposals of the Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Committee for Science to the effect that in order to form any deputies' group it is necessary only to inform the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman in writing.

The draft formulates a mechanism ensuring the participation of representatives of deputies' groups in debates and the participation of these groups in the formation of organs of the Congress and the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Account is taken of proposals for voting to be carried out by name if not less than one-fifth of USSR people's deputies at the Congress and not less than one-fifth of people's deputies at a USSR Supreme Soviet session insist on this. Amendments have been made to the voting procedure to take into account the use of the electronic system, and conditions for secret and open ballots are stipulated.

Incidentally, about voting. At present in the Supreme Soviet we are working on the basis of the provisional Standing Orders, which stipulate that constitutional amendments are adopted by not less than a two-thirds majority of those eligible to vote, laws by a majority of those eligible to vote, and other decisions by a majority of those present. It is deemed expedient to extend this practice to the work of the Congress of People's Deputies.

In general, I think you will agree that much has been done in the direction of the democratization of our work, and this can only be welcomed. Guaranteeing the rights of the minority is an essential attribute of the activity of any democratic parliament.

At the same time I wish particularly to stress that the majority also has the right to demand an appropriate attitude on the part of the minority toward the majority.

It is possible to disagree with it, it is possible to try to prove it wrong, but it is not permissible to regard yourselves as the only true prophets, pin offensive labels on other people, and refuse to respect the decisions adopted.

The draft Standing Orders contain articles designed to promote the creation of an appropriate parliamentary atmosphere at our sessions. In particular, the draft states that the speaker should not use coarse or inappropriate language or call for unlawful and violent actions. In the drafting of this section of the draft law the proposals of People's Deputies Gryazin, Plotniyeks, and others were taken into account. The fact that at sittings of both the Congress and the Supreme Soviet sessions we have already repeatedly encountered inappropriate and rude behavior testifies clearly to the urgency of the formation of a deputies' commission on ethics. I am convinced that the measures proposed in this respect are long overdue and will meet with your support.

Comrades! An important feature of the proposed draft Standing Orders is that the adoption of six of the articles (4, 50, 77, 98, 99, and 173) will require corresponding amendments to the USSR Constitution.

These are articles concerning the safeguarding of the legislative process, the renewal of the composition of the Supreme Soviet and standing commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet not by exactly one-fifth, but by up to one-fifth, and the incorporation in the draft Standing Orders of norms providing for the possibility of the recall of the first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the expression of no confidence in the USSR Government or its individual members. There are also other changes of a constitutional nature.

I wish to observe immediately that this cannot be regarded as the traditional method. After all, according to the established rules, the Standing Orders should comply strictly with the Constitution. But this approach gives us the opportunity to act intensively in the conditions of perestroyka. We are therefore forced to take a step that is not traditional, but is very necessary.

I do not intend in my speech to give a detailed analysis of all the proposals and observations that were taken into account—that would take far too much time. I will only note this point—the majority of them are aimed at further democratizing parliamentary activity, and affect all the functions of the Standing Orders—legislative, executive, and monitoring functions.

A word specifically about some of the changes. Deputies' proposals on measures to eliminate the impersonal nature of the chambers in the examination of draft laws and other matters were taken into account. It is proposed that the Soviet of Nationalities, in the process of examination of a draft law relating primarily to the jurisdiction of that chamber, should discover and take into account the opinion of the union and autonomous republics, autonomous oblasts, and autonomous okrugs on questions affecting their interests. The chapter on the procedure for the examination of state plans and the budget stipulates that these documents are to be sent for preliminary examination to the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission of the Soviet of the Union and the Commission for Questions of the Social and Economic Development of Union and Autonomous Republics, Autonomous Oblasts, and Autonomous Okrugs of the Soviet of Nationalities.

On the problems of the renewal of the USSR Supreme Soviet, we adopted a coordinated proposal from the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order and the Committee on Questions of the Work of the Soviets and the Development of Management and Self-Management. We believe that the proposed formula is more democratic, will make it possible to ensure the effectiveness of rotation in practice, and will preserve the possibility of retaining on the USSR Supreme Soviet those parliamentarians who are engaged in active work.

There was a detailed examination of proposals from a number of people's deputies concerning rotations of certain officials. Thus a group of deputies (Bisher, Boyars, and others) believe that the principle of rotation stipulated in Article 111 of the USSR Constitution should not be extended to deputy chairmen of the chambers. Deputies Borodin, Likhanov, and Danilov propose that the candidacies of chairmen of commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet should be subject to compulsory renewal on equal terms with the other Supreme Soviet members. The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Questions of the Ecology also holds the view that there should be no exceptions to rotations.

These diverse proposals were partially taken into account in the preparation of the final version of the draft Standing Orders. Along with the retention of Article 50, which stipulates that annual renewal does not take place with regard to the chairmen of the chambers and chairmen of standing commissions and committees, the draft incorporates norms to the effect that the chambers have the right to hold new elections of the chairmen of the chambers and their deputies (Article 64), while the powers of the chairmen of standing commissions and committees may be curtailed early by the chambers (Article 77).

In the light of Deputy Dudko's proposal aimed at eliminating the lack of precision in the regulation of the legal status of the Congress Credentials Commission and ad hoc commissions, the title of Chapter 3 of the draft and its content have been clarified.

People's Deputies Lubenchenko, Nazarenko, Ryzhov, and Yablokov deem it necessary to add to the Standing Orders a norm on the responsibility of leaders of state and social organs and other officials for the authenticity of information supplied to the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and their organs and for the deliberate concealment of information. The draft includes the new Article 182 on this question.

It is, of course, impossible to take account of all the proposals and observations in such a complex and detailed document, which affects many—sometimes contradictory—interests. But even so, we consider it incumbent on us to justify our position and establish a relationship with the deputy making the proposal. Anything else would mean establishing a monopoly of decisions, which we categorically reject.

A number of people's deputies submitted a proposal that questions be resolved in the USSR Supreme Soviet on the basis of a consensus of 15 republics. This proposal was discussed comprehensively and in various versions, and was judged unacceptable, as being contrary to the federal principles of the state. Although it is not ruled out that some elements of it could be implemented in future.

The draft Standing Orders contain a provision to the effect that the structure and personnel of the USSR Supreme Soviet secretariat are to be approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the provision on the secretariat by the USSR Supreme Soviet. A number of people's deputies submitted proposals to the effect that the Supreme Soviet itself should approve the structure and personnel of the USSR Supreme Soviet secretariat. This proposal is deemed inexpedient. Life makes constant changes to the structure of the secretariat and its personnel. It would be extremely unreasonable to examine this question at a USSR Supreme Soviet session every time, thereby distracting the deputies from the resolution of more important state affairs.

A number of deputies' proposals relate to the activity of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies presidium. The deputies believe that more attention should be devoted to the content of its work in the Standing Orders. It was proposed, in particular, that the presidium include representatives of groups of people's deputies. We propose here to follow the Constitution, under which the conduct of sessions of the Congress is entrusted to the Supreme Soviet chairman and his deputies.

Deputies Gabrusev and Kirillov raised the question of regulating the procedure for the publication in the local press of information concerning voting by name. Since these problems can be resolved in practice by the local organs by means of reprinting the relevant data from the materials of the Congress and Supreme Soviet sessions, the deputies' proposal was not adopted.

Deputy Medvedev considers it expedient to make provision in the Standing Orders for the possibility of the adoption of a USSR law by a two-thirds majority of people's deputies. It should be noted that under the provisional Standing Orders and Articles 108 and 115 of the USSR Constitution, USSR laws are adopted by a simple majority of deputies' votes. The requirement for a stipulated majority applies only to amendments to the USSR Constitution. Consequently Deputy Medvedev's proposal was not adopted.

There were also proposals and observations demanding additional study with a view to subsequent implementation in other legislative acts.

Comrade deputies!

The draft Standing Orders comprise 185 articles. We have not hitherto examined such a lengthy document. But perhaps we can also say that we have seldom prepared a document so carefully. The thorough examination of the draft Standing Orders is indicated, for instance, by this fact: During its examination at the USSR Supreme Soviet session on 21 November, in the second reading alone, 18 people's deputies spoke. Furthermore at the same session written amendments were received from another 20 people's deputies.

In all, more than 240 observations and proposals from more than 80 deputies were received on the draft Standing Orders. All of them, I repeat, were examined carefully in the working group, which, apart from people's deputies, included important legal experts.

All this clearly gives us grounds to adopt this document.

It is not ruled out that a number of deputies would like to submit new observations. We would like to propose the following option. In the light of the importance of the Standing Orders and the need for a thorough approach to any amendments, let us not open a debate now, but let the deputies send their observations in writing to the editorial commission on the Standing Orders. It could be instructed to report to the Congress on Monday on which of these observations can be adopted, and which should not be. In the event of the rejection of any proposals, I think the Congress could give their authors the opportunity to express their view.

I am confident that the adoption of the Standing Orders will help to strengthen the legal foundations of the activity of the highest organs of state power, increase the efficiency of their work, and deepen the socialist principles of our people's power.

Biryukova Interviewed on Consumer Goods Program

PM1712204689 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Second Edition p 1

[Interview with A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the Bureau for Social Development, by PRAVDA parliamentary correspondent Yu. Ursov after Congress of USSR People's Deputies debates on 16 December, under the rubric "Lightning Interview": "A.P. Biryukova: 'Reform Working for People'"—first paragraph is PRAVDA introduction]

[Text] The discussion of the government program for economic recovery ended yesterday. After the end of the debates A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the Bureau for Social Development, answered questions put by PRAVDA parliamentary correspondent Yu. Ursov.

[Ursov] Aleksandra Pavlovna, what can Soviet people expect from the implementation of the government program?

[Biryukova] A great deal. Given a corresponding labor contribution on their part, of course. To be more specific, the government, in proposing its program to the Congress and proceeding on the basis of the potential available in the country, sets the goal of making people's lives, if not lavish, then at least a little bit richer, a little bit better off, than at present. What criteria were we guided by? First and foremost we took into account the material position of specific population groups, the urgent need to improve the living standard of poorly-off strata and those who are below the poverty line, and also the need to implement further measures to strengthen the social protection of Soviet people. Then we were also guided, I would say, by political criteria. I am talking about the resolution on a priority basis of those social problems that are the source of heightened tension in society.

As early as next year, the stores should receive an additional R47.2 billion worth of Soviet-made industrial goods compared with 1989. That includes some 2 million sewing machines, more than 11 million television sets, some 10 million washing machines, 7 million refrigerators, and much more. The key component in the system of economic recovery measures is undoubtedly the measures to radically improve the situation on the consumer market. In 1990 it is planned to increase retail trade turnover by R41 billion, bringing it up to R435 billion; in 1991—by R102 billion compared with 1990, and eventually by R206-226 billion in 1995. That will make it possible by the end of the first stage in the normalization of the economy and money circulation—in 1992—to overcome, in the main, the imbalance between the population's current monetary income and the goods available, and by the end of the second stage, in 1995, to normalize the market. In other words, in 6 years we are to ensure a growth in commodity turnover comparable to that achieved previously over nearly 20 years.

[Ursov] Well, the program has been approved in the main, now you have to fulfill it....

[Biryukova] Yes, of course, enormous work lies ahead. Not only for us, the union Council of Ministers. In the light of the new regional policy, the policy of giving real meaning to the sovereignty and economic autonomy of the union republics, their role in the implementation of measures to normalize the economy and fill the market with goods and services increases immeasurably. Even today the production of all food products and more than half of all nonfood consumer goods is in the hands of the republics. Light industry, all the construction ministries, and the construction industry base have been handed over to them. With the transfer to regional economic accountability, the only targets set centrally for the republics will be stable volumes of deliveries of consumer goods for the 5-year period for all-union needs and for interrepublican exchanges. This will undoubtedly considerably increase the republics' autonomy and their interest in increasing the production of goods. On the other hand, it will equally step up their responsibility for the state of affairs on the consumer market. After all, it is only when there is a responsible approach both by the center and by the republics that the reform will really start working for people.

Extremism on Right Called Threat to Perestroyka

PM1712172089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by IZVESTIYA parliamentary observer Vyacheslav Shchepotkin: "The View From the Halfway Mark: Notes on the First Days of the Congress"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] The question of constitutional oversight was included on the agenda, and then, after the final approval of the agenda, more or less tranquil work began at the Congress. True, not so tranquil that a certain degree of tension could not be perceived both on "passing" questions and on the main issues. Well, could complaints have been made formerly, for instance, against the chairman of the Credentials Commission at any forum you care to name, and not complaints about his work on the commission, but about his political stance? No. At least, none of us has seen or heard any such thing as far back as we can remember. Yet on the question of the stance of B. Gidaspov, chairman of the Congress Credentials Commission, following the well-known rally of Leningrad Communists, Deputy R. Shchedrin asked this question: Is his position in accordance with the line of perestroyka? This once again indicates the growing concern for the future of perestroyka and in particular its leaders, which can be sensed today not only outside the Kremlin Palace of Congresses. Within the palace itself I have also repeatedly heard the opinion expressed that it is now more important than ever before firmly and confidently to pursue the line of deepening perestroyka, to support its initiators—first and foremost the head of state, M.S. Gorbachev—and the activity of the lawfully elected government and organs of legislative power, and uncompromisingly to rise in defense of the process of democratization. In this context I must mention an appeal that is currently circulating among deputies, collecting more and more signatures, demanding the immediate publication of a complete transcript of the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum, since the most improbable rumors are circulating about that event.

Incidentally, these five Congress days have been marked not only by that appeal. A group of USSR people's deputies representing the scientific public addressed a letter to their colleagues and the voters which is also permeated with anxiety about the future of perestroyka and the pace of renewal. I talked with some of the authors of this appeal: G. Arbatov, V. Goldanskiy, G. Popov, S. Fedorov, A. Yablokov, T. Gamkrelidze. They drew particular attention to the points dealing with the objective evaluation of the processes taking place in the country and the world. "The country's prestige has increased sharply in the eyes of the whole world," the appeal says. "Within the country, albeit with difficulty and in the face of enormous difficulties, the process of democratization and transition to a more reasonable, more efficient way of organizing economic life is gathering pace....

"A revolution is taking place in the country. But we know that any revolution is only worth anything if it can defend itself. Today the most urgent significance is attached to the question of the defense of perestroyka and the consolidation of all society's healthy forces around it. Defense against whom? Primarily against all kinds of extremist forces, which are objectively pushing our society into the quagmire of chaos, universal enmity, and violence. At present, we are convinced, there is a particularly marked growth in extremism from the right and in attempts to take us back to the days before perestroyka—to restore the system of Stalinism and stagnation."

Speaking of the resolution of economic problems, the authors of the appeal stress: "The highest echelons of management must at last adopt an uncompromising position on fundamental questions of economic reform and have the courage to defend it." Another point from this fairly long appeal: "We must maintain a high degree of vigilance," the authors write, "with regard to any attempts to stop—and still more, to reverse—the process of democratization, without which perestroyka is inconceivable and true socialism is inconceivable. We must strengthen the glasnost that is becoming established in the country and protect the freedom of the press against the unceasing attacks on it and the attempts to protect from criticism those forces that are pulling us backward." [passage omitted]

Radio Audience Polled on Congress Results

LD1712184689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Interview with sociologist and candidate of historical science Boris Aleksandrovich Nikiforov by correspondent Yelena Kadysheva; time, place of interview not given—live or recorded]

[Excerpts] [Announcer] This morning on Mayak a sociological listeners' poll was conducted on the problems of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies. In this broadcast you will become acquainted with its results. At the microphone is our correspondent Yelena Kadysheva. [Kadysheva passage omitted]

[Nikiforov] For 3 hours we received a sampling of the opinions and feelings from our entire country. [passage omitted]

From the point of view of objectivity, of course, there are minuses. These are demonstrated by both geography and by the selection, with blank spots. Central Asia did not answer us at all. There was not one call.

[Kadysheva] But it is evidently difficult to get through.

[Nikiforov] But you see, they got through from the Ukraine, and the central regions of Russia, the Urals. There were several calls from Novosibirsk. Considering the sociodemographic block as well as the categories, this selection is not quite scientific because almost half of those who responded to our questions turned out to be engineers and technicians—and in our country, of course, they do not make up such a large part of the population. [passage omitted]

I have already said that for the most part engineers and technicians rang us—42%. Every fourth caller was a pensioner. Twelve percent were scientific workers—mainly economists, which is very valuable. Cultural workers demonstrated little activity. Only four such people rang up—mainly journalists. Very few laborers. Only every tenth caller was a laborer. The remaining 9% were policemen, teachers, doctors, and other professionals.

[Kadysheva] Boris Aleksandrovich, before summing up the result of the poll, let's recall the questions, so....

[Nikiforov] We asked our radio audience to answer the question of how it sees the Congress—does it justify expectations? Here there is a dispiriting picture—some 80% consider that the congress agenda does not correspond to those tasks which confront our country and the restructuring of our economy.

Basically, every second person stressed that it was necessary firstly to adopt a package of laws, that is, a law on land, on ownership, on the Constitution. Every third person considers that Article 6 of the Constitution should be eliminated, and that this should be dealt with now.

[Kadysheva] As I recall, Boris Aleksandrovich, the second question was: Whose speech, the speech of which deputy produced the most favorable impression?

[Nikiforov] A whole list of names was given. We calculated in first place are Yeltsin, Popov, Arbatov, Travkin, Filshin, and Lavrov. These are the names which were repeated most often.

[Kadysheva] Well, the third question was an alternative one: Whose speech produced the most unfavorable impression?

[Nikiforov] Most frequently, party officials were named. It was emphasized as a deficiency of the Congress, that it is like a party economic aktiv, that somewhere the directive slogans of party officials slipped through, which the electoral no longer accepts. They stress that they want more analysis, more depth, and more specific proposals.

[Kadysheva] Boris Aleksandrovich, the fourth question was, I think, the most interesting. You suggested that the radio audience imagine itself on the Congress platform and in 1-minute talk about the most painful subject and to share proposals.

[Nikiforov] They again repeated that it is necessary to adopt a package of laws because without this it is impossible to take perestroyka further. Without this the command-administrative system cannot be toppled. [passage omitted]

18 Dec Congress Session 'Expected To Be Short'

LD1812073989 Moscow TASS in English 0733 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

After yesterday's day off, the Second Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR met at a plenary meeting today to discuss amendments to the Soviet Constitution pertaining to elections to republican and local organs of power. The bill was submitted to the Congress on Saturday by Anatoliy Lukyanov, first deputy president of the Supreme Soviet.

Today's morning sitting is expected to be short. There will be a break for the funeral of Academician Andrey Sakharov, which will take place today afternoon.

Political & Social

Official Announcement of Sakharov Death Issued

LD1512213789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2113 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow, 16 Dec (TASS)—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Minsters announce with great regret the sudden death of Academician Andrey Sakharov, USSR People's Deputy, on 14 December, 1989, at the age of 68.

Burial Details Announced

LD1612125789 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—The commission to organise the funeral of Academician Andrey Sakharov announces that his body will lie in state at the youth palace: 28, Komsomolsky Prospect, (Frunze metro) from 1 p.m. to 5 p.m. on December 17. Civil funeral rites will be held at Luzhniki from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. on December 18.

At the request of the family Sakharov will be buried at the Vostryakovskoye Cemetery in the southwest of Moscow at 3 p.m. on December 18.

Ceremony at Palace of Youth

LD1712113289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1030 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Mocow, 17 Dec (TASS)—The ceremony of paying last respects to Academician Andrey Sakharov, USSR people's deputy, major contemporary scientist, well-known public figure, and Nobel prize-winner, who passed away last Thursday, has begun today at the Palace of Youth, located on one of the central Moscow highways—Komsomolskiy Prospekt.

Mikhail Gorbachev, the Soviet leader, described Academician Andrey Sakharov's decease as a "great loss." Talking last Friday with deputies and journalists during an interval in the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, he said that Andrey Sakharov had his mission, his role in the perestroyka period. "It was possible to argue with him, to agree or disagree, but he was a man of conviction, since, with his own opinions which he openly put forward. I valued this in him and personally regarded him with respect. Although this did not mean that we agreed on everything," Mikhail Gorbachev remarked.

The commission for organising Academician Andrey Sakharov's funeral has announced that the ceremony of paying last respects to the deceased will last for 4 hours today (from 1300 to 1700 Moscow time).

The civil funeral will take place at Luzhniki on Monday, December from 1300 to 1400.

The burial of Academician Andrey Sakharov, at the request of the deceased's family, will take place at Vostryakovskoye cemetery (southwest Moscow) on 18 December at 1500.

Gorbachev Comments on Relations With Sakharov

LD1512210189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] During a break at the Congress of People's Deputies, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev was among deputies and journalists in the foyer:

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] It is a great loss. At this time of perestroyka, Academician Sakharov had his mission, his role. We all understood that. It was possible to argue with him, to agree or disagree. But, because he was a convinced and sincere man, he was no kind of political intriguer. He was a man who had his own thoughts and judgments, and he expressed them openly and directly.

[Unidentified speaker] What personal...? [as heard]

[Gorbachev] I valued that in him. That does not mean that I agreed with him, although there was much with which I did agree.

[Unidentified speakers] Your personal impression, your personal impression, and your relations with him, your personal relations with him—what were they like?

[Gorbachev] They were normal, normal relations. I personally respected him, although—and I say this once again—that did not mean that there was agreement on everything.

[Unidentified speaker] Will you be at the funeral?

[Gorbachev, continues] The point of that is not only that we had some kind of differences. You are attending the congress and can see what differences there are! Does that impede us? If there exists goodwill and a certain understanding of the common goals, then everything else is a search, and that is normal.

[Unidentified speaker] Will you be at his funeral?

[Gorbachev] Yes, the congress will be participating. [end recording] [video shows Gorbachev in a group of unidentified people in foyer]

Says Sakharov's Death 'Great Loss'

LD1512162789 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Excerpt] President Mikhail Gorbachev has described the death of Dr Andrey Sakharov as a great loss. In an interval between the sessions of the Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR today President Gorbachev told newsmen that the Congress would take part in Dr Sakharov's funeral. I cherish the openness with which he voiced his views, Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out, and noted that Dr Sakharov was not a political intriguer. At this time of perestroyka he had his mission. President Gorbachev stressed that although he differed with Dr Sakharov in views he respected him. He said that the commission set up to organize the funeral would consider the proposal to declare nationwide mourning. The commission is led by the chairman of one of the Soviet parliament's houses, Yevgeniy Primakov. [passage omitted on morning session paying homage to Sakharov]

Media Treatment of Sakharov's Death Questioned

PM1812154789 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Dec 89 p 1

[P. Voshchanov untitled article on death of Academician Andrey Sakharov]

[Excerpt] That night, foreign news agencies carried reports by their correspondents accredited in Moscow on the death of Academician Sakharov. But what did we do? I tuned into "Mayak" in the morning and—not a word. Central television was also silent on the matter. Why do we act this way? Is it not because our information services are still placed in conditions where even reports of this nature require "authorization from the top"?

At the start of the working day congress deputies paid their respects to the memory of their colleague. The hall rose to its feet and froze in mournful silence. But I could not shake off the memory of how here, in this very hall, Sakharov had quite recently stood on the rostrum and completed the speech he was making to the accompaniment of clapping, stamping, and shouting. What did he feel then, and how do those who tried to drive him away feel now? Is their compassion and grief genuine? One would like to think so... [Passage omitted]

Yelena Bonner on Sakharov's Life, Funeral

LD1712221289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1800 GMT on 17 December begins its "Seven Days" newscast with a 9-minute report on Sakharov.

The presenter, Sagalayev, opens by saying that events both significant and insignificant, happy and tragic, have taken place. "Last week, Academician Sakharov died at home from a cardiac arrest," he notes. The video shows people queuing outside the Moscow Youth Palace to pay their respects to Sakharov. The correspondent gives a biography of his life against solemn music and stills of his meetings with Reagan, the Pope, Thatcher, and Bush, and video of him speaking on various occasions and of his wife. The video shows the inside of the hall where his body lies.

The correspondent then asks Yelena Bonner, Sakharov's wife: "Yelena Georgiyevna. People like Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov do not vanish into the past. How do you see his future?"

She replies: "I understand that Andrey Dmitriyevich belongs to all people. I would add, all people of goodwill and capable of listening to what someone is saying to them. I think that since Andrey was listened to in the West, people will in time listen to him here; everything that he wrote will be published here, and this will be a conversation between our contemporaries, and perhaps people of the future, and Andrey Dmitriyevich. But I would not like an icon to be made out of a person of life, and he lived a lively and happy life. An icon that various forces would pull to their side.

"His main idea, the idea of convergence of countries with different social and political systems is, generally speaking, a cosmopolitan idea. He believed that the future of humanity lies only in the idea of convergence, that is the coming closer of various systems, and that good sense should prevail.

"He fulfilled himself as a physicist. He fulfilled himself as a citizen. He fulfilled himself as an absolutely fearless person. He feared nothing. He was only afraid of cold things. And he was, on the whole, a very happy person on the personal level, at home. He lived a happy man on earth.

"I would like to say a few words about tomorrow. I do not at all want the day of Andrey Dmitriyevich's funeral to become a day of another Khodynka [reference to catastrophe during coronation celebrations in 1896], of a destroyed cemetery. I would like it to pass of calmly in inner communication with him. I would like to say that Andrey Dmitriyevich will be buried in Vostryakovskaya Cemetery. It is a small cemetery and I do not want many people to come there. I ask that no one, except for those near and dear, should come to the cemetery. I think that this human wish should be understandable to you."

Sagalayev concludes by paying tribute to Sakharov and recalling his first appearance at the First Congress of People's Deputies and how it demonstrated the kind of man he was.

People Pay Tribute to Sakharov

LD1712153889 Moscow TASS in English 1446 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 17 TASS—By TASS special correspondents:

A seemingly endless stream of people has been passing through the Palace of Youth in Komsomolskiy Avenue for four hours already. People are paying their last tribute to Academician Andrey Sakharov, great scientist, prominent public figure and a people's deputy, who died on Thursday.

In spite of the frost—almost 20 degrees below zero Celsius—thousands upon thousands of Muscovites and guests of the capital have formed a many-kilometer long line, patiently awaiting their turn to enter the central hall of the palace where Sakharov is lying in state.

The sounds of solemn music fill the hall. Wreaths line the walls. The guard of honour stands at the coffin, with people who were near and dear to Sakharov, people's deputies, scientists, intellectuals and members of the public changing every five minutes.

Feet shuffling, sighs restrained but audible, many people bring flowers to be laid at the base of the coffin as a sign of their sincere grief for the loss.

Common grief and sincerity infuse what people attending the ceremony say to reporters.

"Sakharov was for us the very embodiment of the world's conscience," People's Deputy Academician

Vitaliy Goldansky told TASS. "He can be best commemorated by creating a single world community which he sought to promote. A community that will live in truth, not in lie, responding to the call of the hearts and following convictions, and not given to time-serving. We should all make efforts to meet the unavoidable hardships of life as courageously and firmly as Andrey Sakharov did when he staunchly defended his ideals".

Aleksandr Mogdalev, a student at the Moscow Institute of Radoelectronics and Automatics, said: "I am here to pay homage to a great scientist and outstanding public figure, indefatigable fighter for democracy".

Sakharov was a hero and a symbol of the Russian intelligentsia, Soviet poet Andrey Voznesenskiy said. He compared Sakharov with apostle Andrey the First—called who according to Christian tradition first came to the lands where centuries later the Russian state was formed to publicise the wholly writ there. "It is symbolic," the poet stressed, "that Sakharov had the same name. I think that many people regarded him as a saint". Andrey Voznesenskiy pointed out that Academician Sakharov had always been open to the world community.

"Happy is the people who is able, at the moment of historic trial, advance a genius capable of arming it with a sword to repel any aggressor", said People's Deputy Academician Roald Sagdeyev.

"Andrey Sakharov never repented his contribution to the creation of the hydrogen bomb. Until his very last day he thoght that the bomb was a necessity that helped to restore strategic parity at that moment".

At the same time, Sagdeyev stressed, he was one of those who was able to bring home to the nations the need to end the policy based on the balance of fear and stop intimidating each other with weapons.

Sagdeyev compared Sakharov with the greatest thinkers and humanists in human history—Mahatma Gandhi and Leo Tolstoy.

People who came to bid farewell to Andrey Sakharov, Sagdeyev believes, are those who were reconciled with their conscience thanks to Sakharov. Sagdeyev also expressed firm confidence that Sakharov was always in the vanguard of perestroyka.

Artem Budyanskiy, a nineteen-year old serviceman, said he had specially asked for a leave to go take farewell of Andrey Dmitriyevich. "No one did so much in the struggle for human rights in the Soviet Union as Sakharov," Artem said.

"His name will always be a symbol in the struggle for the freedom of conscience and democratisation of public life in the Soviet Union."

"The man has died who was not silent even when many others could not muster courage to oppose injustice," Mikhail Takkiy, a postgraduate student of the history of the Communist Party at Moscow University said. "His struggle for consolidating democracy in our country was not in vain".

"When I heard the news of Sakharov's death I felt as if my own defender had died," Moscow doctor Natalya Yarosheva said. "As long as he lived I was confident that he would speak out on behalf of myself and every common person. Everything he said was in line with my feelings and thoughts."

"My consicence told me to come here to pay homage to the fighter for glasnost and democracy. He was a courageous man to whom everyone could turn with his troubles," pensioner Yevgeniy Yevseyev said.

Leaders Attend Sakharov Funeral 18 Dec

LD1812091989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Academician Sakharov, one of the most important scientists of modern times, an eminent public figure, and USSR people's deputy is being seen off on his last journey today by the people of Moscow. This morning, comrades Gorbachev, Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Medvedev, Ryzhkov, Yakovlev, Primakov, Frolov, members of the funeral organizing commission, eminent Soviet scientists, and representatives of public organizations came to the building of the USSR Academy of Sciences presidium to pay their last respects in memory of Andrey Dmitryevich. There are a great number of wreaths on the coffin, among which is one from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the USSR Council of Ministers.

Moscow Memorial Gathering Held for Sakharov

LD1812122789 Moscow TASS in English 1133 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 18 TASS—Tens of thousands of people are now thronging the Luzhnikiy Central Stadium Square in memory of Academician Andrey Sakharov, the outstanding Soviet scientist and public figure. Sakharov died suddenly on December 14.

Among those present at the meeting are people's deputies of the USSR, representatives of the Soviet public, the heads and staff of diplomatic missions accredited in Moscow, and foreign guests.

Newspaper Publishes Special Issue on Sakharov

LD1612232489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Dec 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Papers today published an obituary for Academician Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov, a major scientist of modern times, well-known public figure, USSR people's deputy, member of the Presidium of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Nobel Peace Prize winner. [passage omitted]

A special edition of the paper MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI is devoted to the memory of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov. It opens with an interview with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. I feel this tragedy with all my heart and am enormously pained by it. The memory of Andrey Dmitriyevich Sakharov will remain in our country for ever. This is how the interview begins. The edition also includes the texts of telegrams sent to Andrey Sakharov's family by George Bush and Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn and reactions to the sad news by Academicians Sergey Averintsev and Vitaliy Ginzburg, and by USSR People's Deputies Liana Isakadze, Yevdokiya Gayer, Maryu Lauristin, (Yuriy Yuriy Lyubimov). Academician Sakharov's last speech is published as well as numerous photographs. The special edition of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI will reach Soyuzpechat kiosks in Moscow on Sunday 17 December. It will also be on sale in other towns in the country. [video shows pages of newspaper with pictures of Sakharov]

Sakharov's November Interview in POLITYKA

PM1812095189 Warsaw POLITYKA in Polish 25 Nov 89 p 11

[Interview with USSR People's Deputy Andrey Sakharov by POLITYKA correspondents Jerzy Malczyk and Slawomir Popowski; date, place not given]

[Text] [Interviewer] On Thursday [30 November] Premier Tadeusz Mazowiecki will arrive in Moscow. Your life experience is in certain respects quite similar to his. Can the fact that this politician, who until recently was counted among Polish "Prisoners of conscience," be regarded as an official funeral of the Brezhnev doctrine?

[Sakharov] I think that as long as perestroyka is under way in the Soviet Union—regardless of the difficulties it is encountering along that way—there can be no talk whatsoever of reaching for the Brezhnev doctrine again. That doctrine was an expression of the fear which our apparatus felt for its position. It is no longer needed by perestroyka or its leaders: What is more, it is alien to it. I believe that it can no longer represent a threat to Poland, Hungary, or any other country which embarks on the road of progressive transformations.

Perestroyka International

[Interviewer] In 1980 there was Poland. Then Hungary. In 1985 perestroyka was officially proclaimed. Now we have the GDR and, very likely, Bulgaria. Does this herald a new wave of revolutionary movements like the one which swept through Europe in 1848?

[Sakharov] I believe that the transformations taking place in these countries are indeed events of very great significance. They reflect a major contemporary current of historical development. The integration processes in West Europe are gaining intensity these days, but they are being implemented democratically. The Soviet Union, on the other hand, needs a different process today, and one that is channeled in a different way. Both within the country and in its relations with the other East European countries there is an absolute necessity to introduce changes whose objective is simply freedom and greater independence. I think that all the events taking place today in Poland, in Hungary, and also—as everything seems to suggest—in Bulgaria constitute a reflection of these two trends.

[Interviewer] But not everyone would agree with this view. Take, for example, Nicolae Ceausescu or Kim Il-song. Do you not think that it is high time to set up some kind of "Perestroyka Supporters' International"?

[Sakharov] I am well aware that, while following an extremely firm domestic policy, both Kim Il-song and Ceausescu have been attempting to establish contacts with the Chinese leadership—the same which recently carried out the democracy-crushing operation in Tiananmen Square. However, this is a natural development, since the idea is to bring together kindred political forces. All the same, it is an extremely worrying prospect.

I believe that at the level of social movements we can and should even today advocate and strive for a coming together and joining forces between all those who fight for a radical restructuring in each of our countries. I know, for example, that Solidarity has established contacts with the striking miners of Vorkuta. This is a single instance, but it is symptomatic, all the same. Therefore I maintain that the time has indeed come for the progressive, radical social forces in our countries to establish contacts with one another. As regards developments taking place on a higher level, in the upper echelons of power, this is beyond my reach. Everything is guided by the rules of diplomacy there and constitutes an element of state politics. Of course, I do appreciate these realities. Nevertheless, I am deeply concerned about the fact that the leadership of our country has failed to condemn officially the tragic events which took place in June this year in Beijing.

[Interviewer] Is the process of reconstruction undergoing a crisis? How do you see it? Do you think that the changes could, in fact, go much deeper and eventually destroy the post-Stalinist system?

[Sakharov] True, the Soviet Union is today experiencing an extremely difficult time. The situation is critical and it requires a tremendous sense of responsibility. Its development in the immediate future will be crucial because it will define our whole future. We can speak of a massive crisis of public confidence in the perestroyka-oriented intentions of our leadership as well as in its ability and, indeed, willingness to pull the country out of the crisis. There is an extremely important psychological factor involved here. For example, the latest sociological surveys have revealed that 70 percent of our peasants are afraid of another campaign to "expropriate the kulaks." In these circumstances no agrarian reform is even remotely possible. This is why, if perestroyka is to overcome the obstacles on which it has foundered, it is necessary to launch appropriate political and economic measures immediately. Unfortunately, the leaders of our country keep postponing this operation. They justify the delay with a variety of pretexts; for example, they claim that it is necessary to carry out a nationwide discussion on the proposed bills on agrarian reform, ownership relations, and so on. In other words, the adoption of all the necessary legal acts which are supposed to activate the proposed economic restructuring is being consistently delayed. This is absolutely inadmissible and unjustifiable. I do not know whether we will be able to overcome and eliminate this tendency. It will be very difficult. I also think that it will require greater determination and consistency on the part of the Interregional Group of Deputies. It will also require widespread support from the population. One of the key issues we are facing now is the removal of Article 6 of the Constitution, which asserts the leading role of the party. I believe that the party should enjoy no special constitutional rights which place it in a privileged position in relation to other social forces.

At the moment the party has a gigantic apparatus and a multitude of members at its disposal. These are objective realities which place it in an exceptional situation. However, they still do not justify the exceptional treatment the party receives in the Constitution. I believe that removal of Article 6 from our fundamental law would be an instrumental factor in augmenting the faith of our nation, and in particular the peasantry, in the irreversible nature of perestroyka.

[Interviewer] And yet the issue was dropped from the agenda of the Second Congress of People's Deputies.

[Sakharov] The congress agenda was discussed in the forum of the USSR Supreme Soviet. We were two votes short of winning a discussion of the relevant article of the Constitution to be included in the congress agenda. At the same time it is significant that the group which favored an inclusion of the issue in the congress debate outnumbered those who were against it. And we only fell two votes short because a proportion of the deputies was undecided. In the final count, however, the congress agenda will eventually be decided by the participants themselves. So the issue will doubtless return to be included in the order of the day.

What Do the Forces Think?

[Interviewer] At one of the sessions of the Supreme Soviet, during a discussion of special powers for the military, you warned against the danger of a military coup in the USSR. How real is this danger?

[Sakharov] I spoke from the Supreme Soviet platform on the danger of the introduction of a state of emergency throughout USSR territory in response to events which were limited to the region of Transcaucasia. I am thinking here of the blockade of Armenia and Nagorno-Karabakh. I was of the opinion that those in charge should take measures only in the regions where fire has already broken out rather than douse the entire country with water. I believe that introducing a state of emergency would be an extremely dangerous step. It would be an inadmissible blow to perestroyka and democracy. Is there a real danger of a military coup? It is very hard to forecast developments in this matter. We have a very poor knowledge of the true situation in the army. On the basis of available information I can say that there is a considerable amount of confusion in the forces and a high degree of restlessness. This is a very complex phenomenon. The army as a whole, and especially the junior and staff officer personnel, is close to the people and that is why the concerns and fears of the population are clearly manifest in its ranks. The general staff, on the other hand, is primarily concerned about the process of disarmament and the decline of discipline throughout the country. But the balance of power in the army is really far more complex than this. In both groups there are also representatives of views opposed to the majority consensus. All in all, we can really say very little about the army. It is, in a sense, a closed segment of society and we receive only very limited information about it. I am not able to say anything about the reaction of the regular officers—much less the junior officers or the rank and file soldiers—to the Political Directorate's activity inside the forces. But I think their attitude is far from unambiguous. However, I am not convinced that the army is the force that could initiate a reactionary military coup. The army is the arena where various differentiation processes will be taking place—indeed, they are taking place there already.

[Interviewer] Conflicts in the USSR are literally spilling over into the streets. To what extent is the Soviet parliament, in its present shape and composition, capable of controlling the situation and generally assuming command of the revolution created by perestroyka?

[Sakharov] The whole ethnic and constitutional structure of the country was devised according to the principles of running an empire—a multilevel empire, to be precise. Within that system, certain peoples were subordinate to others, and the Russian people enjoyed a special status. By its very nature such a structure was bound to be rife with profound conflicts. Attempts were made to keep these from erupting by the application of the Stalinist scourge. However, today they are all coming to the surface and the full extent of their tragic dimension is becoming apparent.

Moreover, we must keep in mind here the extremely complex ethnic structure of the Soviet Union, with all the cultural and developmental differences between the individual peoples, not to mention the religious differentiation. It is all very complicated and—in my opinion—the resulting problems can only be solved by a general reform of the ethnic and constitutional system. As its point of departure such a reform should adopt the recognition of every people's right to self-determination and of the independence of all existing ethnic and territorial entities. A "carving out" of borders would be an extremely dangerous move today. It would arouse even more violent emotions. What we need is for free republics to establish a new union in accordance with the wish of their people and on the basis of entirely new union principles. Only in this way will we be able to unravel these numerous and tragically complex knots. The majority of peoples living in the Soviet Union believes that their rights are being restricted and that their economic development is monitored and controlled so as to be profitable only for the central structures. This constitutes a source of conflict, and we could list dozens and dozens of trouble spots which have arisen as a result of this grievance. Let us just consider the examples of the Bashkirs, the Tatars, the Tajiks, and the Uzbeks. The conflict between the last two is particularly severe. And, for instance, there are also the Yakuts, who demand the right to have a union republic of their own—and they are indeed entitled to it. You know only too well what is happening in Moldavia. You are even better informed on the situation in the Baltic republics. Those are natural processes which are taking place there, and if occasionally they assume an exaggerated or even extreme form, it is really quite understandable and pardonable. On the other hand, it is quite unpardonable to strive to maintain the existing status quo at any price: It can lead to such tragedies as the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan.

[Interviewer] Can the parliament take any steps to prevent that?

[Sakharov] Maybe—but it will be very difficult. The parliament was elected in not-altogether democratic elections. A large proportion of the deputies was elected by the apparatus itself, which has complicated the situation considerably. Many deputies are completely unprepared for the task of making radical decisions. They need time to become familiar with this task and to understand the necessity of taking such steps.

Opposition: What It Means

[Interviewer] Can we speak of the existence of a democratic opposition in the Soviet Union? If so, what is its cause and who does it oppose? What position in the Soviet Union's political landscape is occupied by the Interregional Deputies' Group, which you mentioned earlier?

[Sakharov] As a matter of fact, the Soviet Union is faced with the need to introduce a multiparty system. Such a system is quite feasible, and I believe it will be implemented in the near future. Has an opposition emerged yet in the Soviet Union? I think it has, although it is not yet an organized opposition. The interregional group is also a form of opposition movement, though it is an elite movement, comprising exclusively USSR people's deputies. There is also a large number of so-called unofficial groups, which to some degree also constitute opposition, albeit an extraparliamentary opposition. The degree of their commitment to opposition varies, but in most cases it is constructive opposition, whose objective is to ensure that the progress of perestroyka is more dynamic and does not lag behind the realities of life. It is, in a sense, tantamount to urging the authorities on, according to the principle that you do not change horses midstream but simply spur them on. I believe that the mainstream groups of our opposition are guided by this principle. Some groups are more determined than others, and yet others exhibit conservative leanings. Certain groups are committed to individual concerns. For example, the ecologists' opposition group is steadily gaining strength. This is a direct consequence of the fact that issues concerning protection of the environment are often more sharply defined and more urgent than many social welfare problems.

[Interviewer] What kind of scenario will perestroyka follow now?

[Sakharov] I believe that the most advantageous option would involve the approval of a package of some absolutely essential parliamentary acts by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the introduction of the necessary changes in the Constitution. The rest could then be taken care of—on the strength of these acts—by the Supreme Soviet. This would be the optimum solution, and one that would allow us to get going with the implementation of the reforms as soon as January 1 next year. Should this prove not possible, there is an alternative option—but that one would involve a delay of a whole year. This is the opinion of deputy premier Abalkin. As I see it, the damage would be far more extensive. In effect the second option would lead to all existing processes grinding to a halt, and this in turn would result in a further decline in people's confidence in perestroyka. It would be extremely difficult to emerge on honorable terms from such a situation, and it would also require much more determination and consistency than we see applied today.

And the third option. Taking advantage of the aggravation of the ethnic, social, and economic problems, right-wing forces could launch an attempt at retaliation through a "palace revolution" or a military coup d'etat. It is difficult to predict the form that this could take. It is a fact that we can even now observe the disquieting phenomenon of the emergence of a uniform front of right-wing forces in the right-wing camp: from Shafarevich to Medvedev. I am thinking here of Vadim Medvedev of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo. In this camp you can find orthodox Stalinists rubbing shoulders with anticommunists—such as, for example, the aforementioned Shafarevich—and all finding a common language rooted in the shared concept of a Russian empire. What is in fact at stake here is the preservation of power, and it is for the sake of this that such apparently disparate political forces are coming together. This is a very disturbing phenomenon and it must on no account be ignored. It is, in fact, in the interest of the Russian people to enjoy the same rights as all the other peoples. Its privileged status carried with it the need for making greater sacrifices and more extensive self-denials, which in the long term meant that no other nation had suffered such severe losses. I am thinking here of all the social indignities, of the declining and dying towns and villages of Russia, and so on.

Gorbachev: There Is No Alternative

[Interviewer] We know how much depends on Mikhail Gorbachev. How do you see him?

[Sakharov] I am seriously concerned about Gorbachev's policy for a number of reasons. I am also disappointed in more ways than one. I am disappointed with his passive stand with regard to the conflict between Armenia and Azerbaijan. It was his passivity which led this conflict into an impasse. Recently, for example, I have been seriously concerned about the attack on glasnost and on the chief editors of our progressive papers. All this is very disturbing. But at the same time I see no alternative to Gorbachev. I do not know whether this is a good or a bad thing. I do not exclude the possibility that an alternative solution could still emerge, given time. But the least painful solution would be for Gorbachev to radicalize his policies under pressure from the masses. Let me repeat: That would be the best solution of all, both for the country and for Gorbachev.

[Interviewer] To conclude our interview, what would you like to say to the Polish people on the eve of Tadeusz Mazowiecki's official Moscow visit?

[Sakharov] I would first of all like to stress that throughout my life I have always felt that Polish people's problems were as close to my heart as the problems experienced by my own country. My wife, Yelena Bonner, has also felt a similar empathy for you. She maintains personal contacts with her many Polish friends and in general she has a high regard for the democratic movement in Poland. I believe that Poland is ahead of the Soviet Union in all recent developments. I would dearly wish to see it succeed in the course it has chosen. After all, the success of that course will not only influence the fate of your own country—although, of course, this is the most important consideration: It is also bound to create repercussions which will affect the whole socialist camp, including the Soviet Union.

[Interviewer] Thank you for talking to us.

Lithuanian Party Plenum Held 15 Dec

LD1612053589 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, the last in advance of the extraordinary congress due to open next Tuesday, was held in Vilnius. The plenum made partial changes on the agenda. The first item was worded in this way: On the political report of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee to the 20th Congress. It will be delivered by the First Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas. Though the plenum was held behind closed doors, news emerged that the conservative wing strongly attacked the guidelines of the report. Demands were voiced to present the party's past in brighter light. Yet one way or another, the plenum virtually approved the key points of the report and entrusted Algirdas Brazauskas with delivering it at the congress.

Agenda Reported

LD1512193989 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Telephone report by Ceslovas Jursenas, Lithuanian government information spokesman, on the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum, from the plenum hall—recorded]

[Text] One hundred and one out of 142 Central Committee members are present at the plenum. Two Central Committee bureau members are not taking part in the work of the plenum for serious reasons: Zaikauskas, Central Committee secretary, and Vytautas Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, who is ill.

The plenum began with a minute of silence to honor the two deceased Central Committee members [names indistinct].

The agenda of the plenum is as follows:

1. Closer definition of the agenda of the 20th Communist Party Congress.
2. Discussion on the report at the 20th congress.

So, the plenum supported the proposal that the decison adopted at the previous Central Committee plenum changed and the first question of the agenda be formulated as follows: About the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee political report at the 20th Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party. The discussion of the draft of this report was the second item on the agenda of the plenum. At the moment, while you are listening to me, esteemed Comrade A. Brazauskas is making the report.

In a couple of sentences, I'd like to point out what I heard up until the time I left the hall to make a phone call to you.

The main point is that this report is not a report-back report, indeed it is a political report on the situation in Lithuania and on the matters of the Lithuanian Communist Party, as well as about the future both of Lithuania and the Lithuanian Communist Party. Here are the main thoughts which I'd like to briefly quote for you. A. Brazauskas said: "We stand for sovereign Lithuania. The problem is how this is to be achieved, what should the ways to implement this be. The Communists of Lithuania voted for the parliamentary way.

Another thing I'd like to stress, which was pointed out by A. Brazauskas, is that, according to this understanding and to that of the Communists of Lithuania, the USSR can only exist as a Union of Sovereign States and the Union, I quote again, is above the federation.

So, this is what I briefly wanted to report about the Central Committee plenum which is taking place at the moment.

Brazauskas Report Approved

LD1512183489 Moscow TASS in English 1815 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Vilnius December 15 TASS—The Lithuanian Communist Party's Central Committee held a plenary meeting here today.

The participants heard and approved a report to be delivered by Lithuanian party chief Algirdas-Mikolas Brazauskas at the extraordinary 20th congress opening on December 19.

The plenum considered other procedural issues connected with the holding of the party congress.

Lithuanians Term Afghan Invasion 'Crime'

LD1612233189 Vilnius in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Today, the Afghan war participants from Lithuania met in the Kalnu Park in Vilnius to mark the 10th anniversary of the ill-famed Soviet invasion. The meeting was not numerous, yet apart from the former Afghan soldiers participating in it were people representing deportees and human rights organizaitons, the reform movement, Sajudis, as well as some USSR people's deputies for Lithuania.

Most speakers pointed out that laying at the heart of the Afghan war were the very principles of the Bolshevik foreign policy. Lithuania experienced that as early as 1918 when at the sacrifice of the volunteers, the republic's independence had been defended. The year 1939 became decisive for the Baltic states. Following Stalin's death, the Soviet foreign policy did not undergo any changes—Hungary in 1956, Czechoslovakia in 1968, Afghanistan being the last link in the chain of invasions in 1979. And all this being done on behalf of world revolution and interests of international proletariat.

The Afghan war left a deep scar on Lithuania. Out of 4,333 of its young people serving in the far-off country, 88 gave their lives on the battlefield and around 100 were crippled in the prime of life.

The meeting adopted a resolution to be addressed to the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies in Moscow. It urges to rate the war as a crime against the Soviet and Afghan peoples. Then the Afghan war veterans marched to the headquarters of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and flung their medals and orders at the doorway. Timed with the meeting was mass held in the cathedral of Vilnius.

Lithuanian Aktiv Warns Against Party Split

PM1512145489 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 3

[Article by journalist V. Klimchuk: "Preventing a Split: What the Debate in Lithuania's Party Organizations Revealed"]

[Text] Vilnius—An unusual party meeting of Lithuania's Communist supporters of the CPSU was held at the Trade Unions Palace of Culture in Vilnius on 9 December. Taking part were more than 1,000 Communists representing all the republic's cities and rayons.

What kind of force is this—supporters of the CPSU? And why did they need to hold consultations so urgently? About what?

A complex sociopolitical situation has arisen in Lithuania in recent days. The debate on the status of the Lithuanian Communist Party, launched here by Sajudis supporters and supported by the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee leadership, is drawing to a close with no clear result. The initiators of the party polemics demanded the convocation of an extraordinary 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. The 18th Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum set the date for the republican party forum—19 December this year. Then two draft programs and draft statutes (rules) of the Lithuanian Communist Party appeared in the Lithuanian periodical press. These documents indicate that Sajudis activists and their sympathizers have set themselves the task of separating the Lithuanian Communist Party from the CPSU at all costs.

...By 1000 hours the spacious auditorium of the palace and the balcony were filled to the last seat. Those present included Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau members, Central Committee secretaries, and senior officials of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Among them were V. Berezov, S. Apanavichyus, and others. Representatives of the party organizations of Belorussia and the cities of Moscow, Leningrad, Riga, Tallinn, and Kaliningrad also came to the republican party aktiv meeting. Even Netherlands television took an interest in the aktiv meeting. A report "On the Appeal by M.S. Gorbachev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to Lithuania's Communists and the Discussion of the Situation in the Lithuanian Communist Party at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Session" was delivered at the meeting by Doctor of Historical Sciences Professor M. Burokyavichyus, delegate to the forthcoming 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress.

"The situation in Soviet Lithuania has become complex and fraught with unpredictable consequences," the speaker stressed, in particular. "Waves of national hysteria have advanced on the Lithuanian people as never before, and one can understand the concern of the CPSU Central Committee and all true party people in the republic for the future of Lithuania and the future of perestroyka in our great country."

Listening to the historian, the participants in the meeting could not but recall his remarkable articles on Lithuanian history, the truth about the entry of the Lithuanian republic into the Soviet Union, and the atrocities of the nationalists in the Great Patriotic War and the "forest brothers" [counterrevolutionary bandits] in the postwar years. It is in his writings that we find the heartrending words of Ona Sukatskene, a young teacher from Lazdiyay (a rayon city near Poland) shortly before she died: "I am not afraid of the idea of my blood watering the soil of my beloved Motherland one dark night. And when you hear that the bandits have killed me, tell my compatriots that I love the people and my Motherland."

It was the historical truthfulness of the professor's publications that did not suit those who have now donned the garb of activists for perestroyka from the world-famous Sajudis. And sometimes one cannot help being surprised at the facility with which some people, mounting the highest platforms in the republic and the country as a whole, manage to assert that "the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee is distorting the concept of republican sovereignty by asserting in all its documents that it seeks sovereignty within the USSR, that such sovereignty is possible. But such sovereignty is not possible. This repudiation of Lithuania... We should adopt a declaration and dissociate ourselves from such assertions" (From the Sajudis newspaper ATGIMIMAS (REBIRTH) No 15, 1989). The author of that assertion is a man with a legal education, USSR people's deputy, Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] people's deputy, member of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet, and member of the Sajudis Sejm council, Kazimiras Moteka, who left the ranks of the party on the eve of the elections of USSR people's deputies.

And if you believe the rumors circulating in Sajudis circles, the post of minister of justice in a future new Lithuanian state is lined up for K. Moteka.

However, in the main speaker's view, it is not Sajudis that should now be deciding the policy of Soviet Lithuania. Yet that is how it turns out—after all, the republican mass media have been handed over to it. This has led to a growth in unrestrained eulogies for life under the bourgeois system, which cannot but cause concern to people in Lithuania, who remember well the "good" life of those years before the forties.

Concluding his speech, Professor M. Burokyavichyus, to applause from the auditorium, called on the participants in the republican party aktiv to make the greatest possible efforts to prevent a split in the Lithuanian Communist Party.

V. Shved, first secretary of Oktyabrskiy Rayon Party Committee [raykom] in Vilnius City, requested the floor. Many Communists in the republic have heard his bold speeches, based on party principles, many times before. People in Lithuania remember particularly V. Shved's speech at the 3 September 1989 rally in support of the CPSU Central Committee Statement "On the Situation in the Soviet Baltic Republics."

Soon after that rally Sajudis activists started persecuting V. Shved, seeking the early removal of this principled party secretary from his post. It was only through the efforts of rank-and-file CPSU members that they were prevented from implementing this plan. In fact, that kind of reaction by the all-powerful Sajudis is not unique. It is well known in Lithuania how Candidate of Historical Sciences Stanislava Yuonene, lecturer at Vilnius Teacher Training Institute, came to be a "superfluous" person. In that instance, the notorious system of bans on professions operated—because of the teacher's party commitments and her open disagreement with those who have betrayed the ideals of socialism and who slander the party and repudiate Marxism-Leninism.

The same fate—remaining jobless—awaits Doctor of Legal Sciences Professor I. Kucherov from the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Higher Party School. And only because at CPSU Central Committee Secretary V. Medvedev's meeting with delegates to the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress he unequivocally criticized the zealous activity of Sajudis supporters. Now the Higher Party School leadership has shown vigilance, and has not recommended Ivan Danilovich for reelection to the post of professor.

And so V. Shved mounted the party aktiv platform.

"In the republican press," he stressed, "there are increasingly frequent items pushing the idea of Lithuania's inevitable forthcoming secession from the USSR and rupture with the CPSU. The situation has not changed after our Vilnius City party aktiv meeting, whose protest resolution was conveyed promptly both to the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and to all the republic's Communists. However, through attacks on the party, and sometimes even without them, people are working systematically to belittle the role of the CPSU. Lithuania's young people are coming under particular psychological fire, and they cannot always distinguish between a demagogue and someone who sincerely cares about the country's future. That is the dangerous thing!"

"The Lithuanian Communist Party should without doubt be renewed," the comrade's idea was developed by Communist A. Merkel, deputy chief of the soviet and party building faculty at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Higher Party School. "But in the Lithuanian Communist Party's published program documents, they are talking about a new party! And that is another step toward Lithuania's secession from the USSR, and hundreds of thousands more people will be left without a Motherland."

The Motherland. What a fine word! It warms people's hearts. How can one part with the Motherland, if that hour should come? That is the concern expressed by

Vladas Stankyavichyus, a representative of the sociopolitical movement "Uzh Taribu Letuva" [as transliterated] ("For Soviet Lithuania"), recently formed in the city of Druskininkay. "You know," he said to me in the break, "before this meeting I attached no particular significance to the words 'my Motherland is the Soviet Union.' But now, today, I have felt it, and it is so pleasant to hear the greeting 'Comrade Communists.' After all, you know, even workers on the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet hardly use those words now, they look for other forms of address."

Ch. Vysotskiy, second secretary of Shalchininkskiy Lithuanian Communist Party Raykom, spoke emotionally at the party aktiv meeting.

"You see before you," he said, "a representative of the Red Rayon, where 97 percent of Communists have declared that they will remain members of the CPSU."

Yes, it was the inhabitants of this rayon who themselves first turned to the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to request the formation of an autonomous entity for the Polish-speaking population. On 6 September a session of the rayon soviet of people's deputies adopted a decision to proclaim Shalchininkskiy Rayon a Polish national-territorial rayon with self-management within the Lithuanian SSR. And as the reader doubtless already knows, this decision evoked a storm of indignation primarily among those who, when in Moscow, call so loudly for the nations' right to self-determination. Later it was with the help of these voices that the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet resolution was adopted declaring invalid the decisions of both Shalchininkskiy and Vilnyusskiy Rayon Soviets on the formation of a Polish autonomous entity.

At this meeting, which was multinational in nature, there were many young people. Their doubts and aspirations were expressed by Irina Slutsker.

"I want to talk about a most urgent matter," she stressed, "the members of the All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League [komsomol]. As you know, the Lithuanian komsomol numbered 400,000 people in its ranks until recently. After the decision of the well-known republic komsomol congress on secession from the All-Union Lenin Komsomol, fewer than 10,000 registered to join the Lithuanian Komsomol in its new organizational form. Some 40,000 are still paying komsomol dues. The remaining mass of young men and women have been left out of sociopolitical life. But why was this done? The answer is simple: to take the All-Union Lenin Komsomol members out of the political struggle."

That is true. The situation is paradoxical: There are members of the All-Union Lenin Komsomol in the republic, but there are no corresponding organs. There are komsomol organs, but no members. That is why the speaker asked those present for help in organizing a temporary coordination center for the All-Union Lenin Komsomol of Lithuania. Yu. Purmals, representative of the Latvian Communists, L. Gilde, lecturer at Leningrad Teacher Training Institute, and A. Vasilyev, secretary of the Vilnius Electric Welding Equipment Plant Party Committee, called on the party aktiv participants to strengthen the unity of the CPSU's ranks.

"I cannot understand," A. Vaislyev said, "why B. Genzyalis, R. Ozolas, and V. Landsbergis still carry party cards as CPSU members. For a long time they have been professing hatred of the CPSU and doing everything to stop it from functioning in Lithuania. But the republic Communist Party Central Committee will not see or understand that."

The participants in the meeting listened with enormous attention to the speeches of Doctor of Historical Sciences Yu. Yermolavichyus, senior scientific staffer at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Institute of Party History; A. Stankyavichyus, candidate member of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee; Ye. Matuzanis, chief of the Vilnius Internal Affairs Administration; S. Orlauskas, teacher at Vilnius Civil Engineering Institute; and many other representatives of the party organizations of Lithuania's cities and rayons. Running through all their speeches was the idea that unless efforts are pooled to rally the party's ranks, the approaching 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress could not only be a disastrous event in the life of the republic's party organizations, but also undermine the authority of the entire party.

In conclusion the participants in the republican party aktiv meeting approved the text of an appeal from a group of 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress delegates to all the congress delegates and the republic's Communists. They adopted resolutions on the platform of the party organizations and Communists of the Lithuanian SSR within a united CPSU at the 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. The republican party aktiv meeting ended with the singing of the "Internationale." There is, after all, an alternative to a split.

Lithuanian Political Scene Described

PM1512131989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Single Edition p 4

[Article by special correspondent Colonel V. Gavrilenko under the rubric "Lithuania: A Political Review": "Crossroads?"]

[Text] Never before has the temperature of the sociopolitical process in Lithuania been so high or the spectrum of views and opinions so broad as in these days of December. From complete unanimity to mutual exclusion....

The news that the republic has been granted economic sovereignty came as long awaited. And a few days before that the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet formed a "commission for preparing a plan for the restoration of independent Lithuania." It emerges that sovereignty is all very well but there are intentions to "go further...." The republic's Supreme Soviet is sitting almost continuously. Now here, now there, like mushrooms after the rain, there are also emerging, in addition to the existing ones, new alliances, leagues, and associations whose main ideological feature is nostalgia for the prewar bourgeois past. But the most imminent event is the extraordinary 20th Lithuanian Communist Party Congress. The election of deputies is under way.

Almost every day lists appear in the press. In one I find a familiar name—Vladislav Nikolayevich Shved, first secretary of Vilnius' Oktyabrskiy party rayon committee [raykom]. We agreed to meet.

"Vladislav Nikolayevich, the Lithuanian Communist Party Congress is an extraordinary one. Behind that word you can speculate there is another—emergency. What can be expected from this congress?"

"To judge by the drafts of the party program and statute published in the press and also by the document 'Understanding of Lithuanian Communist Party's Independence,' at the congress, according to the idea of the authors of these documents, the communist party may cease to exist in the republic. It is designed to be replaced by a party of non-Marxist bent. In addition a document will apparently be adopted proclaiming the independence of the new party and its withdrawal from the CPSU. And finally I think that under the name of 'communist' a part of 'Sajudis' will be transformed into a new political party...."

Last Friday the republic's parliament adopted the law on changing Articles 6 and 7 of the Lithuanian SSR Constitution. As is well known, Article 6 defined the CPSU as the leading and guiding party in society. It is now drafted as follows: "Parties, public organizations, and public movements are created within the established legislative procedure and operate within the framework of the Constitution and laws of the Lithuanian SSR."

A Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held 1 December. It was addressed by V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who read out M.S. Gorbachev's appeal to the Lithuanian Communists. This public was greeted in different ways in the republic. But however that may be, the ideas expressed in it force Communists to think and to understand that it is impossible to make headway in politics without calculating the consequences, without assuming responsibility for where this will lead.

Addressing the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee and all Communists of the republic, at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum M.S. Gorbachev stressed yet again: "We hope that the congress of the republic's communist party which you will hold in the very near future and which will discuss topical problems will be as it were a working through of the proposals for the 28th CPSU Congress. Comrade Brazauskas, I say this to you frankly, before the entire party Central Committee: Do not belittle your leading role as first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee in the correct solution of these questions."

The polarization of political forces in Lithuania is meanwhile continuing. I saw a headline in the local KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA for 21 November: "What kind of army will Lithuania need?" The item asserts that of course it will not be a Soviet army. This idea pervaded the constituent conference of the "Union of Lithuanian Reserve Officers" recently created in the republic. In general the item merits being cited in full. But I shall single out just one phrase: "Some of those who took part in the conference in the forties perhaps not only had to replace their army greatcoats with a different uniform but also, with guns in their hands, to act alongside those to whom they had recently surrendered without a battle." This phrase gives us to understand at least one thing: The union now unites officers of different generations and, to call things by their names, different armies.

Reserve Colonel A. Kayris, chairman of the "Union of Lithuanian Reserve Officers," agreed to meet. And here we were in the office of the director of the Vilnius special boarding school named for the 50th anniversary of the All-Union Leninist Youth League.

"Algerdas-Stanislavas Pranovich, describe the aims and tasks of the union's creation."

"The union will make efforts to restore the historical truth about the Lithuanian Army and to defend reserve officers' social and other rights, will launch the training of young men for service, will seek to ensure that they serve in their own republic or at least in the Baltic military district, and will be an active champion of the restoration of national formations in Lithuania...."

"At the constituent conference an idea was heard which has been formulated in the newspaper item as follows: '...No one will prepare better than the people assembled here the concept of the restoration of the Lithuanian Army....'

This idea must be understood within the context of the Lithuanians' desire for an autonomous, independent state...."

"And a last question. The republican council of war and labor veterans refused to take part in the work of the constituent conference and was disapproving of the union's creation. Does that mean that there is a split in the republic's veterans movement?"

"Our union is a voluntary organization and we are not dragging anybody toward us by force, so to speak. Our draft statute says: 'Organization of reserve officers of all generations taking part in the Lithuanian movement for perestroyka ("Sajudis") and supporting the plans of the republic's government and the Lithuanian movement for perestroyka....'"

Boys in the uniform of the Suvorov schools drew the attention in the corridors of the boarding school. So for service in what army are they being trained? After all, my interlocutor did not once mention the USSR Armed Forces in which he had served for a good three decades....

I was brought to Kaunas by the same topic. On 23 November a meeting of 1,500 people was held in the city center to mark the 71st anniversary of the creation of the army of bourgeois Lithuania. Again eulogistic speeches were heard about the old Lithuanian Army, as were calls for its re-creation. Salutes were heard in honor of those who died for Lithuania's freedom. I thought: It is a case of those Lithuanian patriots who fought, weapons in hand, against the Hitlerites and their accomplices and after the war against the gangs of nationalists nurtured by the same fascists who terrorized the population of many regions of the republic in the hard postwar years. But that turned out not to be the case. It was a case of those bandits who had received the blessing of the Hitlerites who had fled Lithuania, the bandits equipped with the Hitlerites' weapons who had hidden in the forest and who had on their conscience the ruined lives of thousands of simple Lithuanian peasants, whose main crime was to dream of a better lot. So these "freedom fighters," who were already being loudly called Lithuanian patriots, are now being extolled at almost every street corner. Eulogies are being heard to the "brothers of the forest" in the press, on television, and at various gatherings and meetings. History is being recarved before our very eyes and everything is being turned upside down. Is there not a blasphemous ring to the persistent attempts to rename the streets of Lithuania's cities and villages for the butchers and traitors? Yet there are unfortunately examples of this....

In Kaunasskiy Rayon there is a settlement called Garlyava. It is almost within the Kaunas boundaries. The informal organizations here insist on renaming one of the streets for one Yu. Luksha. Who was Yuozas Luksha? Back in 1940-1941 he collaborated with Hitler's abwehr and then rendered services to the gestapo and found himself in the West, was secretly sent to Lithuania as a foreign intelligence agent, took part in the murder of his compatriots, and died ignominiously in those selfsame Lithuanian forests. And now they want to perpetuate his memory.

I also went to Garlyava and found the settlement soviet executive committee and asked chairman Mindaugis Lukas about this.

"You know," he replied, "not one of the inhabitants of our settlement even considered renaming the street, especially as no one knows who this Luksha is. He is not from around here at all. But for some time some people have been coming to us frequently, calling themselves representatives of 'Sajudis' or the 'Union of Lithuanian Exiles' and persistently advising that we rename the street."

This turn of events seems strange to me, to say the least: bowing down to former SS officers, digging them up and presenting them as defenders and at the same time belittling the role of the Soviet Army, the army which gave 138,000 of its soldiers to save Lithuanian land from slavery. For instance, I have in front of me VECHERNIYE NOVOSTI—the newspaper of the the Vilnius party city committee and city soviet—for 17 November 1989. An entire page in it is devoted to a talk with R. Ozolas, a Lithuanian Supreme Soviet deputy, USSR people's deputy, and member of the "Sajudis" sejmas council. Under the heading "For Me 'Sajudis' Will Always Remain a Miracle" are the far from romantic lines: "Next year we must resolve the question of relations with the occupying army and create our own troop formations and police."

And the already complex living conditions of soldiers, officers, and ensigns in the units and subunits situated on the republic's territory are being complicated still further. One of the main reasons is the acute shortage of housing and the extremely unpleasant daily living conditions. And, to be frank, no improvement is predicted because the republic's government has suspended the operation of the 29 July 1981 CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution which stipulates privileges for reserve servicemen and officers in obtaining housing.

Let us add to this the attempts to deprive servicemen of voting rights. It is well known that elections to the republic's Supreme Soviet will be held in February and elections to the local soviets will be held 24 March. It is also known that the collection of signatures to a document demanding that Soviet Army servicemen be deprived of the right to vote has been announced in Lithuania. And a call to accelerate and expand this campaign was heard from the television screen in the program "Wave of Resurrection." You cannot help asking: What is this—a coincidence or a planned campaign?

I was brought to Kaunas by one further fact: Some 102 former "Afghan" servicemen had decided to renounce the awards they had received. One day in mid-December they intend, after a meeting and demonstration, to hand them in to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet. The appeal on the subject was as follows: "...We believe all the state awards bestowed on us to be unlawful and immoral. We appeal to all participants in the war in Afghanistan to return these awards to their real owners."

In Kaunas I met with R. Ruzas, chairman of the city club of former "Afghans." He is hardly the initiator of this action but he is sure it will take place. I asked: What is actually the reason? He repeats word for word: It is a form of protest against an unpopular war which brought so many troubles to our people.

On the same day I talked with another six "Afghans." "Hand in my order?" S. Kyaushinis, a former sapper and holder of the Order of the Red Star, said in surprise.

"Certainly not, please, I earned it with my blood. And I have no intention of using it as small change in a political game..." But former scout A. Razbadauskas, awarded the "For valor" medal, has a different opinion: I shall go and hand in my medal! Why? I ask. And the former soldier who, you can sense from everything about him, is a fearless man, describes the ordeals which he has had to experience here in his native city. People in Kaunas and indeed in other parts of the republic are in no hurry to come to the aid of the former "Afghan" servicemen in giving them the privileges envisaged for them. And the signatures which have appeared under the appeal, are they not the result of a skillfully exploited emotional outburst?

The opposition forces operating actively in the republic are expanding their influence on public opinion. These processes are also accompanied by the growth of extremes of the following kind: It is claimed that state independence from the USSR is the only path toward the Lithuanian people's national resurrection. I remember the words I heard from one Vilnius inhabitant: "What difference does it make whether you sail along the left bank or the right bank? After all, we are all advancing toward a single goal in any case. A single one?

Jewish Newspaper Published in Lithuania

LD1412101489 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Summary] LITHUANIAN JERUSALEM, a newspaper published by the Jewish Culture Center, is the first Jewish newspaper in this republic in almost 50 years time. Before the war there were many Jewish publications in the Lithuanian Republic.

(Grigoriy Smolenkovas), chief editor of the newspaper, said that the paper would be published in three languages—Yiddish, Lithuanian, and Russian.

Lithuanian SSR Draft Property Law Published

Supreme Soviet Decree

90UN0443B Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 29 Nov 89 p 1

[Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Decree on Lithuanian SSR Draft Law on Principles of Ownership]

[Text] The Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To publish the Lithuanian SSR draft law on the principles of ownership in the newspapers TIYESA, SOVETSKAYA LITVA and CHERVONY SHTANDAR, which has been prepared by the Lithuanian SSR Council of Ministers and approved by a deputies' commission, for public discussion.

2. To instruct the deputies' commission to analyze the proposals and additions received in the course of the discussion and to have submitted before 20 December of this year the revised Lithuanian SSR draft law on the principles of ownership to the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

V. Astrauskas, chairman of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
L. Sabutis, secretary of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.
Vilnius, 22 November 1989.

Text of Draft Property Law

90UN0443A Vilnius SOVETSKAYA LITVA in Russian 29 Nov 89 pp 1, 4

[Text]

I. General Provisions Article 1

This law protects the exclusive right of ownership of the Lithuanian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] enshrined in the Lithuanian SSR [Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitution and regulates the rights of the subjects of ownership to the property belonging to them.

The right of ownership is also regulated in accordance with this law by other laws of the Lithuanian SSR, government decrees and mutual agreements of the subjects of ownership.

Article 2

The higher and local organs of state power and state administration of the Lithuanian SSR display concern for the preservation and multiplication of republic property and also create the conditions for the existence of all types of ownership: a) personal (private), b) collective (group) and c) state.

The republic allows all forms of ownership which are not prohibited by law, namely: the ownership of private persons, a family, the peasant farm, the cooperative, joint-stock company, business association (partnership), public organizations, the religious community, the state, local self-management, Lithuanian SSR joint ventures with other states and others. The Lithuanian SSR supports and stimulates forms of ownership which provide for the most efficient use of resources and afford opportunities for a rise in the living standard of all citizens of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 3

The right to personal (private) and collective (group) ownership for persons who are not citizens of the Lithuanian SSR and foreign legal persons on republic territory is recognized. The laws of the Lithuanian SSR many limit this right.

Objects of the ownership of foreign and international organizations and also joint objects of the ownership of the Lithuanian SSR and other states may be located on Lithuanian SSR territory. The list of such objects and the conditions and duration of their existence are determined by an interstate agreement of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 4

The rights of the subjects of personal (private), collective (group) and state ownership in the republic and beyond are under the protection of the organs of state power and state administration of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 5

The right of the subjects of personal (private), collective (group) and state ownership of the Lithuanian SSR outside of the republic is regulated by laws of the corresponding states and interstate agreements.

II. Subjects and Objects of the Right of Ownership

Article 6

The right of proprietor in the Lithuanian SSR is recognized: a) for the private individual, b) for the collective (group of persons) and c) for the state. The right of proprietor of one's property on the territory of the republic may be limited only by laws of the Lithuanian SSR and treaties with other subjects of ownership which it has concluded.

Article 7

The proprietor owns, utilizes and administers property belonging to him at his discretion.

The proprietor has the right to use the property belonging to him in any economic and other activity not prohibited by law and also in the procedure determined by law to hire other persons for the administration or utilization of his property.

Article 8

The land and its interior, inland and territorial waters, forests and flora and fauna are the exclusive property of the Lithuanian SSR. The Lithuanian SSR has exclusive right to the air space over the republic's territory, to its continental shelf and its economic zone in the Baltic. Persons who are not Lithuanian SSR citizens and foreign legal persons may not utilize these objects without the special consent of the organs of state power of the Lithuanian SSR.

Article 9

Natural, material and financial resources, except for specific types of these resources whose ownership the law prohibits to the corresponding subject, and also products of intellectual activity, the right of ownership of which is recognized by Lithuanian SSR legislation and international law, are subjects of ownership.

Products and income derived from the use of objects of ownership in economic activity belong to the proprietor, if the agreement he has concluded or law of the Lithuanian SSR does not stipulate otherwise.

III. Personal (Private) Ownership

Article 10

The right to personal (private) ownership is recognized for all citizens of the Lithuanian SSR. The property of minors or persons deemed incapable is administered by their guardians and trustees in the procedure determined by law. This law recognizes and protects the right to inherit personal (private) property.

Article 11

The object of personal (private) ownership of citizens of the Lithuanian SSR may be: a) the land and other natural resources, b) material resources of all kinds and c) money and securities and also products of intellectual activity, the right to ownership of which is recognized by Lithuanian SSR legislation and international law.

Certain natural resources (the sea shelf, rivers, lakes, national parks, reservations and such) and material resources (monuments to national culture and such) are prohibited by law from being personally (privately) owned.

Article 12

The right to the purchase and sale of land and other natural resources is limited by the corresponding law.

Land whose possession is defined by law as personal (private) property cannot be leased.

Article 13

The proprietor of land is obliged to observe the procedure of rational land use, which is determined by the pertinent laws and normative instruments of the Lithuanian SSR. Supervision of the observance of these requirements is exercised by the state land-protection authorities of the Lithuanian SSR.

Land areas are confiscated (if obtained free of charge) or redeemed (if purchased) from citizens incapable of effectively administering and utilizing such which they own.

IV. Collective (Group) Ownership

Article 14

Citizens and legal persons have the right to pool their material, financial and natural resources in joint ownership. Depending on the agreement, their common collective (group) ownership may be managed on the basis of the right of common several or common joint ownership.

The laws of the republic protect the rights of the coowners of collective (group) ownership merely in the event of the amalgamation of their property having been legalized in the established procedure. Disputes concerning the division of property and the delineation of common activity are settled by the court, the State Arbitration Commission or an arbitration tribunal in the established procedure.

No one has the right to demand that a proprietor amalgamate his property with someone else against his will.

Article 15

Having decided to pool their property in common several ownership, the subjects of ownership are obliged to stipulate and legalize in the established procedure the proportion of the participation of each coowner of the property, with an indication of the form of its manifestation (in kind, money, securities) and the extent of the property which is a part of the joint ownership which belongs to him. The methods and procedure of the division of the amalgamated property must be agreed at the time of legal registration of the creation of joint several ownership in the event of its liquidation.

Article 16

If the subjects of ownership who have amalgamated or part thereof do not specify in the agreements or statutes the amounts of the share of each coowner, their collective (group) ownership is considered common joint ownership. The rights of the coowners of joint property and their mutual relations are controlled by special laws, and disputes between them are settled by the courts or other authorities in the procedure determined by law.

Article 17

Citizens and legal persons of the Lithuanian SSR have the right to pool their material and financial resources or part thereof with the citizens of other union republics or of foreign countries in joint property. Ownership, utilization and administration thereof are controlled by the corresponding law.

V. State Ownership

Article 18

The rights of subject of state ownership of the Lithuanian SSR belong to the highest and local organs of state power and state administration of the republic. These organs own state property of the Lithuanian SSR, administer it and afford citizens and legal persons the right to utilize this property.

Article 19

The following constitute state property of the Lithuanian SSR:

a) natural resources of the republic, except for those which are personally (privately) or collectively (group) owned;

b) the material resources necessary for performance of the functions of highest and local organs of state power and state administration of the republic and also some of the material resources jointly owned with other union republics;

c) the property of state enterprises and organizations, including state banks;

d) the financial resources which are a part of republic and local budgets and the part of the resources of the union budget which belongs to the republic per agreement with the USSR.

Article 20

Decisions on most important questions concerning state ownership of the republic are the province of the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet.

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet issues legislative instruments regulating the right of ownership (the budget, money turnover, credit, payments, customs dues and such).

Article 21

At the decision of Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet some of the material or natural resources which is in state ownership may become the personal or collective (group) property of citizens of the republic. State property may be transferred to a new proprietor: a) free of charge and b) with compensation for all or part of the value of the property obtained. The resources obtained are channeled into republic or local budgets.

The transfer free of charge of state natural or material resources to the common several ownership of private and legal persons, except for instances provided for by special laws, is prohibited.

Property which is personally (privately) or collectively (group) owned or part thereof may be confiscated with compensation to state ownership by way of a penalty for an infraction.

Article 22

The organs of state administration of the Lithuanian SSR (Council of Ministers, ministries, departments and organs of local self-management), as subjects of the right of ownership, operate within the framework of activity stipulated by the Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet and within the limits of available resources. State regulation of the economic activity of the republic and the local economy are their province. The rights of the organs of state administration and their duties and responsibility are regulated by the corresponding laws.

Article 23

The Lithuanian SSR Supreme Soviet transfers some of the rights of republic state ownership to the organs of local self-management, which own, administer and utilize state property with regard for their territorial specifics. Property of the organs of local self-management is regulated by the Lithuanian SSR Law on the Principles of Local Self-Management.

Vilnius Rally Supports Unity with USSR

LD1812112889 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Summary] A rally of 2,000 people was held on 17 December in Kalnu Park, Vilnius, by the Lithuanian Interfront Movement "Yedinstvo," which comprises Russian-speaking citizens of the republic. The rally was held to discuss the 20th Extraordinary Congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party, and the speakers at the rally expressed a unanimous opinion: Only a united CPSU and Lithuania within the Soviet Union. At the end of the rally a resolution to the congress of the Lithuanian Communist Party was adopted.

It is interesting to note that the city's Lenin Rayon Executive Committee refused to grant the permission for "Yedinstvo" to hold the rally outside the museum of the revolution.

Lithuanian Leader on Congress of People's Deputies

LD1512191489

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian on 15 December at 1400 GMT broadcasts the "regular Friday interview" with A. Brazauskas, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Brazauskas is interviewed by Benas Rupeika. The interview was recorded earlier on 15 December; the place of the interview is not given.

Benas Rueika begins the interview by explaining that although the interview was scheduled to begin at 0900 today, A. Brazauskas was unable to start because he was listening, by telephone from Moscow, to an interview with K. Prunskine to Lithuanian radio. Prunskine gave her account of the meeting with M. Gorbachev.

Brazauskas comments on the interview and says that it is useful for Lithuanian deputies to hear what M. Gorbachev's personal opinion is on the issues that are widely discussed in this republic. Brazauskas says: "I got the impression that Comrade Gorbachev invited us to cooperate, to be allies, allies during a very responsible and complex transition period. We started using this word, and indeed this word is beginning to acquire more of a real meaning, because this period and the second Congress of the People's Deputies—I was there at the beginning only—revealed that, in fact, forces are regrouping; the correlation of these forces is changing. I have political forces in mind. Both the very start of the congress and an attempt and very strong wish voiced by a considerable number of people's deputies to have the discussion and amendment of article six included into the agenda already speaks volumes."

Brazauskas goes on to talk about the importance of the transition period. He points out that economic the basis subordinated to this republic must be strong, which at the moment it is not. He points out that the law on economic independence states that many questions must be solved by "coming to an agreement with the USSR administration. This paragraph is very vague and it is not a very good paragraph to us because much could depend on the decisions of the all-union administration. These decisions could go either way. Then we would have to look for allies somewhere else, not in the administration. I have in mind namely the party leadership and specifically Comrade Gorbachev; he was the main person, his voice was decisive in adopting the law on economic independence, and his voice will remain decisive in the implementation of this law. Therefore, consolidation and unity are most indispensible," said Brazauskas.

Brazauskas then mentions the incident at the congress and how traumatic it was for Vytautas Astrauskas.

He then speaks about the upcoming Lithuanian party congress and the plenum during which he had to acquaint the Central Committee members with the report. He says: "I would not like to make comments on the report now, because it will be read on Tuesday, and all of Lithuania will hear it, because the congress will probably be relayed live by television and radio." He speaks about the decisions which must be made at the congress and says that "this is a task of great responsibility, a task for the transition period, because we have undertaken a very responsible step and will have to take the right step." Brazauskas says he is glad that the mass media in this republic has lately devoted much attention to the matters related to the Communist Party of this republic and its independence.

Brazauskas comments on Ryzhkov's report at the congress: "I think the discussion of the issue was rather superficial. I believe that the problem is too complex and too important to be discussed so lightly. Because the economic reform and principles of managing the people's economy in general virtually remain the same, it is not enough to transfer what we have from one shelf to another. We must set up such a system that perhaps might not comply with the concept of the socialist economy. This stereotypical thinking must be thrown out."

Brazauskas then speaks more specifically about discussions at the recent CPSU Central Committee plenum. "Another very interesting issue which caused considerable discussion was the setting up of a bureau of the Russian CPSU."

"[Rupeika] The CPSU Bureau for Russia, right?

"[Brazauskas] Yes, the CPSU Bureau for Russia. I tried to translate this term from Russian; you see, we have not yet gotten used to this term.

"[Rupeika] I wonder if this is a return to the past, when there were VKP (b) [all-union communist party] bureaus for Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Suslov—that sort of thing. Or is this looking forward to the autonomization of Russia, the beginning of sovereignty of Russia?

"[Brazauskas] You know, I am not to be able to answer this question, because I am not thoroughly convinced that there is something new in this."

Rupeika asks if a parallel to the Lithuanian Communist Party and its struggle for independence can be drawn here. Brazauskas says no. He then talks about criticism and attacks launched personally on him as first secretary during the debates at the CPSU Central Committee plenum. Brazauskas says that he expected much more criticism. Brazauskas gives a detailed account of the CPSU Central Committee plenum.

Brazauskas then speaks about the upcoming congress and says that what he fears most is the split in the party's ranks, because a split on political grounds is bad enough, but the issue of nationality is also there, too.

In conclusion, he mentions his sadness about the death of A. Sakharov. The interview concludes.

Marchers Protest Recruit's Shooting by Militiamen

LD1812121189 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0800 GMT 18 Dec 89

[Text] (Kestutis Liekis) was seriously wounded in Taurage rayon by a militiaman for refusing to do military service. On 16 December, a protest march condemning the event was organized by the Lithuanian League of Liberty, the "Jaunoji Lietuva," and the "Geneva 49" committee. The participants marched through the town's streets, briefly stopping at the buildings of the Party Committee and the Military Commissariat. The march was concluded by a meeting outside the building housing departments of the Internal Affairs Ministry, the Procurator's Office, and the local KGB. About 200 people took part in the rally.

New Latvian Legal Publication Issued

LD1512173789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Today saw the appearance of the first issue of the monthly LATVIYSKIY YURIST [Latvian Lawyer]. Its main topics have been defined: the fight against crime; the creation of a law-governed state; and the popularization of legal knowledge.

On the pages of this issue readers will find a program statement by Birkaus, president of the Lawyers' Society of Latvia. Also published is a joint declaration by legal workers in the Baltic republics about the creation of a professional association. An article by USSR People's Deputies Gdlyan and Ivanov is featured too.

Appeal Made for Renewal of Latvian Party

90UN0416A Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 28 Nov 89 p 1

[Text] Comrade Communists! The party is faced with a decisive choice. We must not remain aloof and temporize. Let us rid ourselves of self-deception and heed the people's opinion and let us not conceal the results of our deliberations, however bitter and unusual.

Let us acknowledge that we have hitherto been in the grip of utopian ideals, dogmatic principles and undemocratic actions and have been unable to make the meaning and purpose of our practical activity the interests of the people and each individual. Not for many years has the CPSU been a party in the true meaning of the word: It has changed from being a public movement and mass-political organization into a mechanism of power. A frozen theory divorced from real life, claims to the undisputed truth, the party apparatus' monopoly of power, administration and ideology, disregard for objective economic laws and the suppression of political pluralism have brought society and the party itself to crisis point. For this reason many communists are unwilling to continue to be members and work in the party ranks.

Will we Latvian Communists know how to overcome our own mistakes and resistance of conservative forces and so transform the party as to win the genuine support of the people instead of the imaginary authority determined by law? In our view, we will so know only if we make the people's interests the basis of party activity.

Realization of the Latvian Communist Party action program adopted in August determined the start of progressive change in the party. However, it is obvious even now that only the first steps have been taken in the restructuring of the party. We believe that the revival and unity of the Latvian Communist Party cannot be achieved by ideological compromise, as has been the case hitherto. Change in the policy of the Latvian Communist Party is a matter brooking no delay. Cardinal changes in all walks of life are impossible without democratic reform of the party.

To achieve this we put forward the following fundamental guidelines:

The Latvian Communist Party advocates the priority of values common to all mankind and the creation of a society which is based on the principles of democratic socialism, abandoning the utopian goal of the building of a communist society and a dogmatic interpretation of Marxism-Leninism.

Defending in full nations' right to self-determination and in accordance with the wishes of the Latvian people, the Latvian Communist Party participates in the creation of an independent, democratic, socialist Latvian state.

In the name of the interests of the Latvian people the Latvian Communist Party should be a politically, organizationally and economically independent party. We recognize the right of the communists of each republic to themselves determine the status of their organization. We are prepared to organize our relations with the CPSU, the communist parties of the union republics and other parties on the basis of mutual respect and equal partnership.

The Latvian Communist Party should be an integral part of the political system of a parliamentary Latvian state, renouncing the constitutionally guaranteed monopoly of power.

Radically change the organizing basis of the Latvian Communist Party. Replace centralism causing stagnation with party discipline based on a recognized community of ideas and aims; provide for freedom of discussion and guarantee minority rights; abolish the current party schedule system.

Taking its historically evolved multinational composition as a basis, the Latvian Communist Party should advocate the consolidation in the party and throughout society of people of different nationalities on the basis of principles common to all mankind, equality and democratism. It should dispel feelings of instability and apathy.

We are aware that each day of delay impedes the progress of the restructuring of society and for this reason advocate the convening of the Latvian Communist Party congress in the spring of 1990 and the adoption at the congress of the Latvian Communist Party Program and Rules.

We call on Latvia's communists to discuss and support our proposals.

[Signed] Members of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee:
Ya. Blazhevich, A. Brigmanis, L. Zile, I. Krastinsh, I. Priyeditis, M. Rukmane, V. Sarkan, E. Svars.
Secretaries of rayon (city) party committees and primary party organizations:
Kh. Plauks, A. Kaulinsh, D. Skulte, M. Goba, A. Indzeris, T. Zvaygznon, G. Demiters, E. Slyshan, E. Taurinsh, Ya. Vanag, Ya. Krastin, A. Chishchyakov, P. Ludbarzhs, I. Kalninsh, E. Gaylitis, V. Khermanis, A. Yermaka, V. Ozolinsh, A. Endzinsh, A. Tsars, Yu. Shvolkovskis, I. Paegle, R. Skudra, G. Valuyevs, S. Strods, Yu. Karlsons, A. Ozers, E. Pelkaus, A. Putninsh, Kh. Zile, A. Uzulinsh.

Latvian With Ties Abroad Has Weapons Cache

90UN0396A Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Nov 89 p 2

[TASS report: "A Grenade Against a Thief?"]

[Text] Riga, 29 November. (LATINFORM—TASS). "Bayard" and "Schmeisser" pistols, a PPSh [Shragin submachinegun], and a huge amount of ammunition for them, a land mine that is rusty but can still be used, a homemade grenade with the inscription "For Motherland and Freedom" on the handle, a bayonet, a dagger, rapiers, the uniform of an aviation warrant officer, lists of aides, an organizational structure chart...all this was put on the desk of the chief of the Riga Criminal Investigation Department where it looked just like the equipment found on a saboteur in a spy film. However, the "arsenal" was discovered in the apartment of L. Hirshsons, a cooperative photographer who lives on Gustav Street. What does it all mean?

"The results of the investigation will help provide an answer to this question," says Yu. Ritinsh, deputy chief of the Criminal Investigation Department, Administration of Interior Affairs under the Riga Gorispolkom [city soviet executive committee]. "We came across this arsenal when our organized crime control group was investigating one of its cases. The owner of the weapons explained that he had found them in the attic and decided to keep them to have something to defend himself with in case of a burglary. L. Hirshsons said during questioning that he was a photographer in the "Focus" cooperative.

Describing the owner of the "arsenal," the head of the Latvian KGB press group, S.Z. Miervaldis, recalled that L. Hirshsons had visited Sweden in the period from February through April of this year. While in Sweden he became a member of the Latvian Social Democratic Workers Party [LSDRP]. According to a Radio Free Europe broadcast, he had a personal meeting with the deputy chairman of the party's foreign committee, V. Zalkaln. It is hard not to remember the serious effect produced by the appearance of this LSDRP figure at the political discussion that concluded the sixth European Latvian song festival. When he was asked how to achieve independence in Latvia, he replied, among other things, that "we will do that ourselves and not without some bloodshed at that." This comment by Zalkaln was broadcast to Free Europe listeners on August 6 of this year. The representative of the Latvian KGB concluded that the investigation would disclose whether there was a connection between what was said by the LSDRP deputy chairman and the actions of Hirshsons, an active member of that party as, according to his own words, he is the chairman of the coordination center of the LSDRP organization bureau.

'Electoral Union' Impact on Tallinn Poll Viewed

PM1412133589 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 14 Dec 89 p 1

[G. Zapozhnikova report: "Tallinn. Elections"]

[Text] The lion with the raised paw—Tallinn's medieval symbol—on the posters has become the sign of Tallinn's electoral union, which has brought together 12 social movements ahead of the elections.

Pamphlets circulated by International Movement and the United Council of Labor Collectives have appeared in the city, carrying appeals to boycott the elections. Their arguments: The Law on Elections to Local Soviets, adopted by the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet session, contradicts the Constitution and the USSR's international-legal obligations (remember, it was this very law, or more precisely, its statute on deputies' and voters' residential qualifications that was the cause of the summer strikes). And although a compromise was later worked out—5 years' residence remains obligatory only for candidate deputies, while all citizens of the republic received suffrage—the reflection of the strike flame has reached the elections. The boycott's initiators also believe that the elections are pointless—no mechanism has been worked out for taking minority opinions into account, so the Russian-speaking deputies in the city soviet will have no role to play, they believe.

Who should be elected if many candidates' programs are similar? Furthermore, as previous elections have shown, the path from the program to its implementation is a long one—so long that a deputy can manage to forget his promises. Who should be given preference? Three days before the elections, the telephone numbers of the Tallinn electoral union were printed in the evening paper. I rang them. Edgar Yaaro, who was on duty, gave recommendations: "There are no candidates whom we would find unacceptable. But we would particularly recommend the following..."

The Tallinn electoral union recommended 63 of its candidates for the 80 seats in the city soviet. When I was dictating the material, the final results were not yet known, but it was already clear that the electoral union had managed to obtain over half of the targeted 63 seats. Furthermore, the union's information service really helped, and Edgar Yaaro was involved in real coordination work. I know that it is thanks to him that, in my electoral district alone, three voters were brought ballot boxes to their hospital beds. It is significant that more calls with such requests were received at the electoral union than at the Central Electoral Commission. It is difficult to compete with the preparatory program displayed by the social movements. It was only in the last few days that the Tallinn City Party Committee and one of the Tallinn rayon party committees made an appeal to the voters.

Losing is good in that it is useful. It means that conclusions must be drawn. At the People's Front Organizational Center for Elections, center chairman Reyn Koov, an All-Union Lenin Communist Youth League Central Committee employee until recently, was writing a table of results from every rayon. Between 46 and 78 percent of the seats were taken by people who owed a great deal to the People's Front.

And what about the losers?

I called Vladimir Vinogradov, member of the International Movement presidium and asked him to comment on the situation. "Victory was not our object," he said. "We did not chose these organs of power, and consequently we are free from any commitments to them."

Admittedly, commitments to non-voters still remain.

Estonian Deputy on Discussion of Declarations

LD1812112989 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Summary from Poor reception] Ivar Raig, member of a 400-strong USSR Congress of People's Deputies deputy group on agriculture says that they have met Gorbachev, Ryzhkov, Ligachev, and others for a discussion. He says the Estonians, having drawn up two declarations—one on land to be given back to the people and the other one on declaring collectivization to have been a crime against the USSR peoples—are supported by a number of deputies. Raig says there is support to have the declarations put out for discussion on Monday [18 December] but at the same time, letters have already appeared calling for a condemnation of the authors of such declarations.

Latvian Election Results Detailed

PM1512141389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Election Results"]

[Text] The election results were summed up 14 December at a session of the Latvian Central Electoral Commission. Precisely 1,525,569 voters participated in the elections—77.5%. The voters' activeness was higher in rural localities (84.5%) than in the republic capital—just over 70%.

Deputies were elected in 12,732 okrugs (87.3%). A second round or a runoff is to take place in the remaining 1,854 okrugs. The elections passed off successfully in 386 of Riga's 580 okrugs—two-thirds of the total number. The elections will be continued in 194 okrugs.

The TASS correspondent was told at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee that, of the 36 first secretaries of party rayon and city committees who ran, 24 candidates gained the necessary number of votes in the first round, four have to face a second round, and eight were not elected.

Of the 117 secretaries of party city and rayon committees and chairmen of executive committees who ran in the republic as a whole, 66 were elected. Eighteen candidates have to continue the fight for deputies' seats.

The second round of the elections is scheduled for 17 December.

Baltic Public Opinion on Independence

90UN0454A Riga SOVETSKIY MOLODEZH in Russian 23 Nov 89 p 3

[Article by Renata Laricheva: "'The Baltic Way is the Baltic Way'"]

[Text] It resembled a medical consultation—Baltic sociologists assembled at a conference in the Yurmala Science Center organized by the Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences Institute of Philosophy and Law were citing symptom after symptom. And they were new symptoms.

The magic word "independence" is hovering over the Baltic. But are we ready for it?

Estonian sociologists have ascertained Tallinn residents' readiness for serious changes in the republic's economy. After all, the laws of the market are severe laws. On different levels of the social ladder there are different shades of opinion. From a desire to learn a new specialty and a readiness to pay for it to the firm belief that Estonia's economic independence "gambit" will fail. All evaluations have a strongly expressed political nuance. A stratification of society is occurring before our very eyes, and serious economic restructuring will intensify this process.

Studies of the Latvian State University Applied Sociology Department produced a surprise result: Beyond the generation enamored of political activity there is a vacuum. Today, 35-50 year-olds are the most active. Sociological information makes it possible to say that the young people are distinguished by less than average political assertiveness. Today's 20-year-olds have grown up in a society of double morals and have grown used to disbelieving slogans proclaimed publicly. They are realists, and the reality is such: The young person has no prospects of a normal social career. Polls show that, after having acquired higher education, career depends on capabilities for no more than 15-20%. Young people are particularly defenseless in the face of the prospect of growing inflation and a declining living standard. Sociologists believe that a model of protection at the time of transition from the planned economy to the free market is needed. Without this, no young person will go in for assertive political activity.

Lithuania: The standing of "Sajudis," as of other public and political organizations, has fallen in recent months. A decline in interests in politics and a certain disenchantment. Philosophers and ideologists are receding into the background, economists and sociologists are coming on the scene. People (approximately 60% of those polled) want "Sajudis" and the Communist Party to work together and put up joint candidates at the elections.

A political consultative committee, of which the scientific intelligentsia is a part, has been working for 6 months now under the auspices of the first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. Several dozen wise men think about and forecast people's prospects and in open discussion speak about the most complex and most unpleasant questions and try out various versions of a solution. This is a help not only to the Central Committee but also the whole Lithuanian people. The republic is on the threshold of the Communist Party Congress, which is set for 19 December. The preparations for it are not of the standard type. Movements in the party which have been working on their own alternative documents for the congress and their own programs—they have been published—have been formed. The Lithuanian Communist Party draft program and statutes were drawn up mainly by scholars and artistic personnel. They contain the following proposition also: Following the congress, all members of the CPSU working on the territory of the republic automatically become members of the Lithuanian Communist Party, other than those who state that they are leaving and those who wish to remain members of the CPSU. There will be debate and struggle at the congress. Some division is inevitable. Many people are wishing the congress fails.

How does the political situation in the Baltic appear if it is viewed through the eyes of sociologists from the "Center"? Polls show that actual public opinion is quite different from the way in which it is portrayed by the central press and television.

Yuriy Aleksandrovich Levada, doctor of philosophical sciences (All-Union Center for Public Opinion Research), speaks:

"We view the Baltic with affection, excitement and hope. And it is becoming increasingly clear that the Baltic way is the Baltic way and that the Russian way (however much I would like to take you as a model) is different. Let us try and trace how tactfully and intelligently our big country is treating what is happening here. In a poll at the end of summer we cautiously asked the question of how the population would view discussion of the problem of the withdrawal of individual republics from the Union. The replies were such: Half maintained that this was normal and that it had long been time it were seriously and comprehensively discussed, approximately 20% believed that the question was an unpleasant one, but what could be done—it had to be discussed. A negligible number believed that it should not be discussed. In September the poll of another group of pollsters for Leningrad formulated the question more pointedly: 'How would you view the possible withdrawal of the Baltic from the USSR if the population of these republics were to vote for this?' Approximately the same ideas were obtained there: Practically all strata, except for the administrative-command groups, believe that no resistance to such a decision is possible. Thus the mood of society is far ahead of the political decisions and even ahead of the discussion of the issue in the popular press, in the scholarly press even more.

"In the mass of the population radical sentiments are considerably more prevalent than at the Congress of the

Supreme Soviet level. Studies of this period have shown that there are two majorities: One influences decision-making, but the other majority is the mass of the population, and it is different. Thus at the start of the congress the Moscow group was beaten down, but it gained the support of a majority of the population. Academician Sakharov's Afghan position was greeted in such a way that it almost became a question of physical measures, yet the polls showed that 55% of the population shared this position fully and that a further 20% shared it in the main.

"Or the following interesting fact. The banned topic of a multiparty system has been normal for the whole of society with us for a year. Some 27% of those polled believe that a multiparty system is inevitable. Another opinion is that we have a sufficient multiparty system as it is; the CPSU has lost its unity to such an extent that it may be considered an alliance of different forces. Fifteen percent believes that this is not a part of our tradition, and there remain no more than 3% who are sure that the very idea is anti-Soviet and not to be discussed.

"An important social event of the year has been the awakening of the forces of the people's masses. What was started by the miners was unusual, contradictory, dangerous and economically unprofitable, but this was a guarantee of the fact that all social reality in the country is becoming different.

"We see the diverse and quite organized offensives of the conservative forces. Last year and the year before last there were individual outbursts, but as of this spring there has been a rehearsal for an attempt at a turnabout, an attempt to find a point of contact between conservatism at the top and spontaneous mass conservatism from below. Our polls show that on the surface there are demands for the shelves to be filled, for fair distribution and for the removal of bureaucrats' privileges. Normal demands. But there is an attempt to link certain currents emanating from the upper echelons of power with those which go no further than protests against the shortages. Movements are being organized and organizations created under this flag. It is not yet clear whether such a phenomenon could embrace some in any way serious mass of people or whether our population has learned sufficiently from experience of association with those who would now wish it blessings. I suspect that no serious mass movement will result on this basis, but some elements thereof could be dangerous. This is so new that we have not had time to detect anything even in day-to-day soundings. But we need to do so.

"It was only quite recently that we took up the study of public opinion. We are employing methods applied in the West, but there are stable democratic societies there, and ours has yet to take shape and public opinion is not yet firm on its feet. Which group of society could prove to be the leading one, regardless of how general it is? This might seem to be of the most interest, but, alas, we as yet lack experience of determining such a thing."

Leningrad Party Secretary Gidaspov Interviewed

LD1812000389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Dec 89

[From the "Seven Days" Newscast]

[Text] Now we have an interview with one of the colorful personalities on the political firmament of our society today—Boris Venyaminovich Gidaspov. His name is associated equally with major science and with the stormy processes that have recently appeared in the party.

[Reporter Dmitriy Kiselev] Boris Venyaminovich, I have invited you outside for two reasons. First, recently you have become a very popular personality and consequently too much of a temptation for journalists, and inside the Palace of Congresses the members of the press are literally tearing you apart. Second, it seems to me that you are more used to speaking outdoors.

[Gidaspov] I am very grateful you invited me here. Indeed, at least we shall be able to breathe some fresh air while we are having our discussion.

[Kiselev] Recently you became the head of the Leningrad Party organization—not only of the City Committee but also of the Oblast Party Committee—and you put forward a fairly independent program. Could you summarize its essence in a couple of words?

[Gidaspov] Indeed, a little over 100 days have passed and there is this saying, or principle...

[Kiselev, interrupting] Tradition.

[Gidaspot] ...that's right, tradition, principle, that 100 days represents a borderline for a politician, after which he should be accountable for his actions, for what he has done over the 100 days. Our program contains three major blocks—democratization of the party; democratization of the society along with the party, and the party should be marching at the head of this; and radical economic reform based on diversity of forms of property and diversity of the economy.

[Kiselev] How do you see the fact that your name is linked to conservatism and you are even being called a rising leader of the conservatives?

[Gidaspov, laughing] Well, I am not leader material, that's point one. As far as labels are concerned, with us that's a tradition, the ability to apply labels. I normally answer this as follows: very often in science people resort to this method in polemics—you have some private point of view, you attribute it to your opponent and then tear him to bits. I think that this image of me as a conservative is being created precisely by real conservatives.

[Kiselev] Aha. You said you were not leader material. Presumably this was established a long time ago. I know that you used to play soccer but you were not a forward, were you?

[Gidaspov, laughing] That's right, I was center-half.

[kiselev] And do you remain so?

[Gidaspov] Yes, of course. Well, what can I say about this? A leader, after all, is someone outstanding. In our party I see no leader apart from Mikhail Sergeyevich. The fact that I am called the leader of the Leningrad Communists I do not even find flattering, rather somewhat embrassing. I am the secretary of the Oblast Party Committee. And I am trying to organize the leadership in the same manner I have organized leadership all my lie, on the basis of principles of collective decisionmaking.

[Kiselev] But these colleagues were also Comrade Solovyev's colleagues, weren't they? Or have they changed?

[Gidaspov] You know, people change. Some of the people who worked when Grigoriy Vasilyevich Romanov, Lev Nikolayevich Zaykov, and Yuriy Filippovich Solovyev were oblast committee secretaries are still there. They are still there. But I also have my own circle, a very wide circle of new people.

[Kiselev] So new people have come in now, have they?

[Gidaspov] Yes, of course. Incidentally, our primary organization, or rather the party organization in Leningrad, has been extensively renewed. Even MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI noted that.

[Kiselev] The leadership of the party organization?

[Gidaspov] The leadership, who evidently came looking for bulwarks of reactionary forces, as it were, found young people who had transferred from industry, from scientific institutes, many with academic degrees and people who, like me, have only recently begun working in the party apparatus and who express unorthodox ideas and use unorthodox methods.

[Kiselev] Tell me, how does your standpoint differ from the standpoint of the Central Committee? At the rally, at the first rally in Leningrad, which you opened, there were slogans, you know.

[Gidaspov] I know, I know, I know. Yes, of course. A rally is a rally. Emotions and passions rage at rallies. Not all Communists are accustomed to speaking to large masses of people. I, however, feel confident at the rostrum, because I went through a very serious election campaign. And there is a certain category of people who are electrified by the emotions at such a meeting and they are carried away to one side, some to the right, others to the left. But this should be forgiven. It is simply a shortcoming.

[Kiselev] So you mean that you do not agree with all the slogans.

[Gidaspov] By no means all.

[Kiselev] For example, which ones do you disagree with?

[Gidaspov] Well, for example, the one which said: Boris, you're wrong! I believe that Boris is right. [laughs]

[Kiselev] Do you mean yourself or Yeltsin?

[Gidaspov] Myself. Myself. It was written under my photograph: Boris, you're wrong!

[Kiselev] What about the one which said: Borya plus Nina equals love!?

[Gidaspov] Oh, that's nonsense, that's simply childishness. The second rally was organized by the People's Front, the Democratic Union, and possibly some other trends, because there was a colorful array of different flags there: black, tricolored, multicolored, all sorts. But also, Communists came to this meeting for the first time. And regardless of whether it went well or badly, it is of fundamental importance that people of sufficiently different views stood together and discussed Leningrad's problems and the problems of the whole country. The first step has been taken. This ice of distrust for each other must be broken.

[Kiselev] You support the informal leadership of the party. In this case, how did you vote when Article 6 of the Constitution, or rather the inclusion of it on the agenda of the congress, was put to the vote?

[Gidaspov] I understand you. Well, when I spoke in Leningrad and when we adopted the decision, we wrote down these words: that the role of the Communist Party must not be declared by any document. I said moreover that prior to 1977, there was no Article 6 and there was Stalinism; after 1977 the article existed and there was the period of stagnation. Everything happened and it has nothing to do with the article. Therefore, I am fundamentally against Article 6, in principle. But this time, I voted for it not to be discussed. Why? Because, it seems to me incorrect to take any article out of the context of the Constitution.

[Kiselev] What is your forecast for when we will have a new constitution?

[Gidaspov] You know, I want to have the kind of constitution according to which my children, my grandchildren, my grandchildren's children, and my grandchildren's grandchildren will live. Well, let it be in 6 months, let it be a year. I hope, all the same....

[Kiselev] But you are for the acceleration of this process?

[Gidaspov] Undoubtedly. Yes, of course. Categorically for it. I am against haste, but for acceleration.

[Kiselev] Thank you.

[Gidaspov] Thank you. [Video shows two men standing in the snow on the grounds of the Kremlin]

Gidaspov Comments on Gorbachev

LD1712151389 Moscow in Spanish to Spain 2200 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Several months ago the well-known scientist, corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences and Peope's Deputy of the USSR Boris Gidaspov was elected first secretary of the party's regional committee in the city of Leningrad. In the recess between sessions of the Congress of People's Deputies Boris Gidaspov granted our correspondent an interview.

Our correspondent asked him: We would like to clarify what you think of Mikhail Gorbachev. At one of the rallies at which you were present I saw several slogans which criticized the general secretary's policy.

Replying to this question Boris Gidaspov said that he is one of the people who in fact first supported Gorbachev with their concrete actions in the area of economic reforms. [Words indistinct] several months after my election I succeeded in wresting a series of enterprises in the so-called command system from the tutelage of the ministries. We may create the first consortium in our country, Boris Gidaspov says. In this way I have shown in practice which positions I support. As far as mistakes are concerned, I do not think Gorbachev has made any serious mistakes, since our country is vast, the political situation is (?very tense), and Gorbachev is making great efforts to avoid the confrontation of forces occupying different positions. I can see how difficult it is for him and I try to help him. What we are doing in Leningrad could be called liberal conservatism or conservative liberalism, but we are also consolidating all the forces which could contribute to perestroyka.

We asked: What can the wing of the party which you represent be called? They say you aspire to the role of a centrist.

Gidaspov replied: A centrist? If you want, I am a centrist. The Leningrad party organization is bringing forces together. In such a situation where would [words indistinct] other public organizations? My position was made clear in a report published in the daily LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA. In it I said—and I still say—that we offer the hand of friendship and solidarity to all the democratic currents which occupy socialist positions. We accept any form of cooperation. Then (?it) says that, preparing ourselves for the elections—that is, for the local government bodies—we urge all communists (?and those without a party, the leaders of all movements, to take part actively in the elections and perhaps put forward a single list. In order to analyze the ideas of perestroyka now as never before we need active people who have their point of view and who firmly defend their position. We understand perfectly that in defending any position we make ourselves a target for criticism. But this is inevitable, Boris Gidaspov says.

More on Pro-Perestroyka Leningrad Meeting

90UN0472A Moscow SOVETSKAYA KULTURA in Russian 9 Dec 89 p 1

[Correspondent V. Potemkin report: "The Idea of Dialogue is Conquering"]

[Text] Leningrad—Following the well-known mass party meeting held in Leningrad on 22 November, the city's community took a long time to settle down. Then thousands-strong masses assembled once again on 6 December at the Lenin Sports-Concert Complex.

As is known, on 23 November that first mass meeting was shown on television, and the resolution was published in Leningrad's newspapers. As the organizers of the meeting had hoped, this was a high point of Leningraders' political life and has given rise to literally an explosion of mass interest big politics. There has not been such activity and such a polarity of opinions before, not even at election time.

Somewhat embarrassing were the pretentiousness and imperiousness of many of the speeches and the very resolution of the 22 November meeting. The following proposition thereof, for example: "We Leningrad communists have determined our positions and look for support for these positions on the part of the communist parties of the union republics and the party organizations of krays and oblasts of the Russian Federation. We expect this of the CPSU Central Committee also." Indeed, if 200 participants in a joint plenum and approximately 20,000 participants in a mass meeting think thus, is it legitimate to present this as the opinion of all Leningrad communists?

On 6 December at the V.I. Lenin Sports-Concert Complex once again a mass meeting in the same spot.

Credit where credit is due: It was held in organized fashion, the guiding idea being the unification of all democratic forces of the party in the struggle for perestroyka and for renewed socialism. The main popular slogans, perhaps, were: "'Yes' to Democratic CPSU Members, 'No' to 'Lawyers' and Demagogues!" "Let Us Defend Mikhail Sergeyevich!".... A unique situation to some extent when the communist rank and file and nonparty people speak without any beckoning from above in support of the party's top leadership. This provides much food for thought.

Opponents were not given leave to speak at the previous meeting. Here opinions were heard in an unconstrained manner. B. Gidaspov and O. Kuzin, first deputy head of the obkom [oblast party committee] ideology department, both spoke. USSR people's deputies, the communist rank and file, representatives of the working class and scientific and artistic intelligentsia, political workers, and soldiers spoke also. It was natural that serious criticism was heard at this meeting of the obkom and its machinery, and it is now clear that Leningrad party officials have to provide clear and precise answers to many of the questions of those attending the meeting.

The majority of speeches amounted to the thought that before holding the CPSU Central Committee and the Politburo to account, it is necessary to bring order to bear in Leningrad and democratize the situation in the Leningrad party organization. For this it is not necessary to wait for guiding instructions from above, it is necessary to act, taking into consideration the particular features of local conditions, and stimulate creative initiative.

Of course, a mass meeting does not mean diplomatic negotiations. There were polemical extremes and excitement. There were also flags of prerevolution Russia (surely it is not with these that some people intended defending perestroyka?!) But the idea not of confrontation but dialogue leading to consolidation conquered, nonetheless. The idea that it is time to consolidate the forces of perestroyka was embodied also in the well-considered resolution, which was purged of excitement. It says, inter alia: "Today each party and public organization should be the initiators of democratic change without waiting for instructions from above.... The dividing line now does not run between those who are ranked as supporters or opponents of socialism, not between the intelligentsia and the workers and not between representatives of different nationalities, but between the adherents to the administative-command system on the one hand and the supporters of the democracy of the sovereignty of the soviets and a market economy on the other...."

Here are further lines from the resolution: "We Leningraders, communists and nonparty people, declare our support for the policy of radical political and economic reforms being pursued in the country. We welcome the endeavor of M.S. Gorbachev and his supporters to impart to our society a democratic character and humane appearance."

Omsk Oblast Party Committee Secretary Elected

LD1612212789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] A plenum of the Omsk Oblast Party Committee met today and considered an organizational issue. The plenum satisfied Pokhitaylo's request and released him from his duties as first secretary of the Oblast Party Committee in connection with his retirement on pension. The plenum was preceded with a wide exchange of opinions on possible candidates for the post of first secretary of the oblast party activists, plenums of rayon and town committees, and at primary party organizations, 35 people were named as candidates for the post. After a comprehensive discussion plenum participants entered three candidates in the lists for secret voting. By a majority vote, (Leontyev) who previously worked as chairman of the executive committee of the Omsk Oblast Soviet of Peoples' Deputies, was elected first secretary of the Omsk Oblast Party Committee.

Moscow Meeting Supports Economic Reforms

904A0098A Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 10 Dec 89 p 4

[Article by I. Zhagel "In Support of Reforms"]

[Text] **On 8 December a meeting took place in Moscow aimed at showing support for a radical reform of our economy. It was organized by the USSR Managers Union, the "Rossiya" Cooperatives Association, the Moscow Bank Union, and the Association of Young Enterprise Leaders. Also present were representatives of many other associations from what is known as the alternative economy.**

It cannot be said that the speakers supported any given one, let us say, official concept of perestroyka. Their opinions varied rather widely in range. All of them agreed, however, that the policy of reforms our country is conducting at the moment is meeting more and more resistance. Forces are consolidating that would want to turn the country back, to take us back to wage-leveling and distribution.

Here one could recall the demonstration in front of the Column Hall of the House of Unions. It was organized at the time the hall housed the All-Union conference on economic reforms and the participants of the demonstration carried such slogans as "Make Academicians Answer!" and "Stop Selling Russia!" The bureaucrats in the ministries also stepped up their resistance and used the absence of legislation to try and smother the new sprouts by excessive taxation.

Under these conditions many of the speakers called also for consolidation of their own forces with the purpose of defending the interests of the people who have the initiative and enough enterpreneural spirit and who would wish to contribute their effort, skills, and know-how to the improvement of our economy. Another purpose of such consolidation is an expert and intelligent propaganda of the tasks and advantages of a radical reform. Even now the enterprises of the new economy are making a considerable contribution to provide the market with consumer goods and improve the well-being of the Soviet people. The general public should be made aware of these facts.

The chairman of the Moscow Bank Union gave the following example: At present commercial banks make about 10% of all the capital investments in Moscow. Among others, they opened credits for the development of furniture and construction materials production.

"We should try to disprove false rumors blaming the appearance of ration cards for butter and sugar on the new cooperatives," said B. Strelmakov, manager of the medical-technical firm "Polimed." "Food rationing has been used in many regions of our country for dozens of years. Those people who speak against the economic reform consequently stand for the further impoverishment of the country. If we decide to recognize economy as a science, then we have to remove its ideological coloring."

Specific importance was given by the speakers to the propaganda of their achievements due to the coming local elections. The perspectives of new enterprises in many ways depend on the people that will be elected as local authorities.

To conclude the meeting the executive director of the Association of Young Enterprise Leaders of the USSR, K. Zatulin, read a plea to all active members of the society asking them to participate in the struggle for a radical economic reform.

Ukraine Adopts Decree on Languages Law

LD1712204489 Kiev in English to North America 0030 GMT 17 Dec 89

[Text] The government of the Ukraine has adopted a decree on primary measures to fulfill the law on languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. It was approved at the 10th session of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation. The document envisages the elaboration of a special program of development of the state Ukrainian and other languages in the republic.

Yerevan Reports on 15 Dec Earthquake in Armenia

NC1712075289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0200 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Armenian seismic stations recorded an earthquake measuring 4 to 5 points [scale not specified] at 1045 local time on 15 December. Its epicenter was in the Spitak earthquake zone almost 8 to 10 kilometers south(?east) of Kirovakan. The tremor registered 3 points in Kirovakan and 2 to 5 points in Stepanavan, but it was not felt in Leninakan, which is 55 km from the epicenter. No victims or destruction resulted. The geological sciences institute of the Armenian Academy of Sciences informed an ARMENPRES correspondent that the new tremor confirms that new processes beneath the earth's crust are a product of the destructive earthquake in Spitak on 7 December 1988. Aftershocks from that quake are still being felt. Since then, around 140 strong (?tremors) measuring from 5 to 7.5 points and over 8,000 weak tremors have been registered in the area of the earthquake's epicenter.

Yerevan Maintains Railway Blockade Continues

NC1712122189 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1900 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Contrary to the assurances issued by the higher authorities and contrary to the fabricated news aired by the central television, the blockade of the railway entering our republic is being maintained by Azerbaijan. On the average, 12 to 14 trains would have been expected in Yerevan each day, but since the start of December only 4 trains have arrived at Yerevan station. That is, the leaders of the Azerbaijan National Front allow slight train movements to coincide with the expected statement of the central government that the blockade has already been lifted. Well, what can one do? There is one way out of it—to finally give up the hope of using Azerbaijan railway services and to speedily consider laying rail tracks through other territories.

Interregional Deputies Discuss Opposition Tactics

PM1612164889 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[S. Karkhanin report: "Opposition and Posturing: Notes From a Meeting of the Interregional Deputies' Group"]

[Text] "Why don't you join the Interregional Group? Vote against Article 6 of the Constitution!" And then threats and coarse language are heard over the phone. M. Rakhmanova, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Women's Affairs, told me on the first day of the present congress about this "telephone terrorism," to which the deputies are frequently subjected at the Moskva Hotel. And after what she said, it is hard to believe Deputy V. Stadnik, who asserted at the group's meeting: "The people associate with our Interregional Deputies' Group everything good that could happen in the country." One journalist whispered to his neighbor: "Evidently they haven't called him yet."

Talk about the forthcoming meeting was circulating even before it began. And indeed, one could foresee the turn events would take. The past months have provided an opportunity to perceive a kind of pattern to the tactics of the group's leaders, a pattern that smacks of those same "strong-arm methods" of which they are so keen to accuse others. Remember that the organizers of the Interregional Deputies' Group set it up immediately after the majority of them failed to gain a place on the Supreme Soviet at the first Congress. When the session did not include on the agenda for the second congress an item on Article 6 of the Constitution, the next step followed—a call for a unionwide political strike, which, incidentally, met with no support in the country; even within the group many people did not agree with it. And then the proposal to begin debating Article 6 was rejected by the congress itself. It was not hard to predict that a sharp reaction would once again follow. And these expectations were justified.

Even so, it seemed to me that for many of the participants in the meeting, the idea put forward by Yu. Afanasyev that a political opposition should be formed from among the people's deputies, under the title "Radical Democratic Bloc," came as a bolt from the blue. And it immediately became clear how right Deputy S. Averintsev was when he said that "Beyond a certain minimum, we are not people who share the same views, but comrades in misfortune." Back at the organizational meeting in Cinema House in the summer, one could clearly perceive the wide disparity of motives that had led people to the Interregional Deputies' Group. Some people thought that in the group it would be possible to improve the drafting of legislative documents, some people hoped to warm themselves in the glow of its leaders' popularity, some people's ambitiousness overshadowed the substance of the matter... All these factors again emerged in speeches at the present meeting.

V. Zubkov: "I joined the group because I wanted to be an opponent of the existing authorities"; O. Borodin: "What we need is not perestroyka, but rebirth on a different basis"; N. Medvedev: "The germs, the nuclei of future parties will be born within the opposition." But other voices were also heard in the auditorium. V. Karasev: "There is a parliamentary platform for resolving questions of importance to the country. But I did not see Yu. Afanasyev or G. Popov at the session, I heard only one speech—and that an unfortunate one—by B. Yeltsin. We were told that there are 700-800 deputies in the group. Where are they now?" S. Shapkhayev: "What the people expect from us is not declarations of opposition, but concrete work. Here we are now engaging in a theoretical discussion, and in the meantime the Congress is in progress, the sections are in session." Yu. Karyakin: "We did not work to even a quarter of our capacity in the Supreme Soviet. I think we should begin with ourselves."

Yes, it is always more difficult to begin with oneself than to fling loud political phraseology about. Once again, there was more than enough of that. The aggressively obedient majority, a totalitarian regime, the restoration of the times of Stalinism and stagnation—all these alarming terms, which have entered the rally vocabulary of the "radical" orators, no longer fool many people. What lies behind the calls to "urgently rescue democracy and Gorbachev"? The camouflage can be regarded as having been discarded: The Interregional Group activists intend to abandon the consolidation of all deputies' forces, openly substituting confrontation. And the main thing is to shrug off all responsibility for what is happening in the country: Many of the speakers at the meeting insisted on this.

There is no need to spell out in detail the significance of the intention to escape from the shared harness and take a place at the roadside so as to goad on from there the people who are pulling the cart. Incidentally, the Interregional Deputies' Group leaders stress that they will only act in that way if their ultimatum to the Congress is not acted on. There are several versions of the ultimatum, it is formulated in various ways in the drafts. But the majority contain certain familiar points: the immediate revision of the Constitution, a change in the system for chairmanship at Congress sessions, the urgent introduction of new laws on ownership, the lease system, the press. "Otherwise we will ask the voters to support us," says the draft prepared by Yu.N. Afanasyev, and the veiled threat that can clearly be heard in these words brings to mind the anonymous telephone calls to deputies' rooms in the Moskva Hotel.

Two speakers described the day of the meeting as a "historic moment." But the true weight of several decisions that were given that same grandiose title is well known. It is more apposite to recall the lessons of history in another context. The price of political games based mainly on self-seeking intentions can prove too high, especially since it is entirely different people who have to settle these accounts. "Nothing is easier," V.I. Lenin warned, "than to use demagoguery to carry away the crowd, which can later be convinced of its mistake only by the most bitter sufferings."

And on that day by no means all the speakers approved the idea of creating an opposition, either in form or in content. A different option, for instance, was proposed—a parliamentary faction. N. Travkin's rejoinder acted like a cold shower on the hottest heads: "If a political opposition springs up, its Communist participants will have to leave the party. I have been a party member for 20 years, and I do not intend to leave it. I trust M.S. Gorbachev more than Yu. Afanasyev." Nikolay Ilich was supported by Professor A. Zhuravlev from Minsk, chairman of the deputies' subcommission on prices: "We cannot join the opposition, all we can do is strike up a posture."

So the graph of the polemics showed wide fluctuations. It is not surprising that the composition of the Interregional Group is so unstable, and after the meeting it is almost a certainty that its ranks will thin. According to B. Yeltsin, the Interregional Deputies' Group now has 359 members, but it seems that they have never once all assembled. It is not surprising that some speakers lamented: "When my voters ask me what our group is doing, I have to invent something." At the same time the coordinating council is firmly pursuing its line of psychological pressure, constantly talking about its large number of supporters. If that is not manipulating public opinion, what else can you call such tactics?

In the next room a section was in session, discussing ways of improving the country's economy, but the 3-hour debate at the group's meeting resulted in only one conclusion, for which it was not really necessary to waste so much valuable Congress time. It was decided, on the basis of several proposed draft documents, to formulate a general declaration of the Interregional Deputies' Group, which, in all probability, will be read out at the Congress in the next few days. In the formulas and appeals, will reason prevail over emotions, ambitions, and delusions? Will the group's position be constructive not in words, but in practice? As yet, it is hard to answer. And another question also remained open. What if the phrase about "comrades in misfortune" is true because to get one's convictions and delusions mixed up is one of the most distressing of misfortunes? At the moment, one thing is clear: If you swallow the bait of an alluring slogan about opposition, all you can do in reality is to strike up a posture which, with the best will in the world, cannot be called attractive.

Kaluga Gorkom Political Club To Pursue Dialogue

PM0712170389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
6 Dec 89 Second Edition p 2

[Interview in Kaluga with V. Gorchakov, first secretary of the Kaluga City Party Committee, by correspondent N. Kireyev: "Yes to Dialogue!"; first paragraph is introduction; date of interview not given]

[Text] Kaluga—A voters' political club has begun to function in Kaluga under the City CPSU Committee [gorkom]. Our correspondent met with one of the three cochairmen of the club's council—V. Gorchakov, first secretary of the Party Gorkom—and asked him to talk about the aim of this initiative.

[Gorchakov] The decision to set up the club was made at the gorkom plenum. Then it was discussed by about 500 primary party organization secretaries. At first the doubt arose in some people's minds: Won't the "novice" be a rival to its brother under the city soviet executive committee? Not at all! Another seven clubs are operating in the city besides these two. So, each voter can choose the one which is most to his liking.

[Kireyev] All the same, explain why the Party Gorkom needed its own club. In political work can you not use clubs which have already been registered?

[Gorchakov] Our decision is dictated by the desire to have our own platform for the propaganda and elucidation of the city party organization's election platform, and for uniting the people who share it. The statute says: "The club's task is to help the democratic formation of the organs of Soviet power, improve the population's self-management, and expand glasnost." Our meetings are held in precisely this spirit. So, on the voters' suggestion, three cochairmen were elected to head the club's council. The writer S. Vasilchikov and worker V. Zhuravlev obtained this right, as well as myself.

[Kireyev] Who can become a club member? Are there any limitations, if only on territorial grounds or party affiliation?

[Gorchakov] There are no stipulations. There is a special item in the regulation which says that all Kaluga's voters can participate in the work of the sittings held in the House of Political Enlightenment. Interesting conversations have been planned on political, social, and economic topics, and we shall be talking about the party's role in perestroyka. We shall invite economists and lawyers who are well known in the country. We are going to try to make sure that people get firsthand answers to all the questions which interest them, and not rely on rumor and conjecture. The main point for us is not to leave unanswered a single voter's request, and to take prompt and effective measures regarding them. We shall counter demagoguery with constructive dialogue.

Cable TV To Begin Broadcasts in Kostamuksha

LD1412101789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
1400 GMT 12 Dec 89

[Summary] A cable television channel is to start work in Kostamuksha. Test programs have been carried out by young specialists from Petrozavodsk. The channel will carry entertainment programs, cartoons, and later, local news. An exchange of video news is planned with Kostamuksha's twin town of Kuhmo, Finland.

Increased Foreign Travel Brings 'Problems'

PM1312151389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
13 Dec 89 Second Edition p 6

[A. Urvantsev report under the rubric "At the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs": "Human Rights"]

[Text] In the first 11 months of the year 201,000 Soviet citizens—or 120% more than in the same period last year—have received permission to emigrate. Around 30,000 other applications are currently being considered.

These figures were quoted at a USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] briefing for journalists yesterday. The subject of the briefing was a discussion on bringing Soviet legislation into line with international acts on human rights.

"Recently," R. Kuznetsov, chief of the USSR MVD Visas and Registrations Administration [UVIR], said, "a number of specific measures have been implemented aimed at further expanding Soviet people's contacts with foreign citizens—on a personal basis, for instance—in the spirit of the Vienna meeting final document, and at safeguarding every Soviet citizen's right to leave and return to the USSR."

Nonetheless, the UVIR services face many problems. In the event of new exit and entry legislation being adopted, the number of people wishing to travel abroad could rise many times over, according to preliminary figures. The UVIR would need an additional 5,000 staff to meet all their demands and requests... There is already a shortage of forms and foreign-travel passports.

"The USSR MVD is actively and directly participating in drawing up draft laws aimed at strengthening citizens' rights and legitimate interests, taking account of the demands of international acts, not least the pact on civic and political rights," V. Yanchenkov, chief of the ministry's department for cooperation with the mass media, noted. "Thus, the USSR and union republic draft guidelines for the administration of criminal justice prepared jointly with the USSR Prosecutor's Office and the Academy of Sciences State and Law Institute were recently sent to the USSR Supreme Soviet."

An entirely new feature of this legislation is the right to safeguard convicts' freedom of conscience. Guarantees have also been established for the implementation of this right. For instance, those sentenced to imprisonment will be permitted to visit places of worship.

It was also stated at the briefing that for the first time USSR draft laws have been worked out "On the Rights and Duties of the Soviet Militia" and "On the Duties and Rights of the USSR MVD Internal Troops in Protecting Public Order."

Economic

Limits Imposed on Currency Exports to Bloc States

PM1612173089 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 15

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR State Bank and the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity"]

[Text] The USSR State Bank [Gosbank] and the USSR Bank for Foreign Economic Activity announce that the USSR Government has adopted a resolution on measures to protect the USSR's domestic consumer market and prevent abuses involving the exportation of Soviet currency and speculation in consumer goods.

Similar measures have already been adopted by a number of socialist countries in order to protect national interests and stabilize domestic consumer markets.

Thus, the GDR, Poland, and the CSSR have imposed additional customs restrictions on the exportat of consumer goods. At the same time, the aforementioned countries, as well as Hungary, have reduced the cash sums made available to the Soviet Union in their national currencies for sale to Soviet citizens traveling to those countries. Furthermore, Hungary and Czechoslovakia have stopped buying rubles in cash from Soviet citizens.

In order to regulate the provision of currency to Soviet citizens traveling to Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the SRV, the GDR, the DPRK, Cuba, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia, the following limits have been set for sales of currency for export (remittance):

- for travel on official business, for work, on tourist trips, on trips to rest homes, sanatoriums, and other therapeutic institutions, and also for visiting relatives working in Soviet institutions abroad and in international organizations—up to R100 per trip;
- for travel to visit relatives and acquaintances living permanently in those countries—up to R250 per year, regardless of the number of trips.

At the same time, it is stipulated that Soviet citizens traveling temporarily to Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the CSSR, and Mongolia may export to those countries Soviet currency registered by the customs organs up to R30 in cash, without the right to spend it abroad; it is obligatory to reimport this currency to the USSR.

The above rules come into force on 1 January 1990.

The USSR Gosbank reports that in accordance with a USSR Council of Ministers resolution, starting 18 December 1989 the procedure for the application of the special reduced ruble exchange rate for noncommercial operations is extended to operations of a noncommercial nature with funds used to settle accounts between the USSR and the SFRY.

Shalayev Discusses Laws To Resolve Labor Disputes

904F0050A Moscow TRUD in Russian 9 Dec 89 pp 1-2

[Report on interview with the Chairman of the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, S.A. Shalayev, by V. Golovachev: "The Right to a Defense"; date and place not given]

[Text] AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Chairman S.A. Shalayev discusses the draft laws submitted by the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU to the USSR Supreme Soviet providing for changes in the procedures for reviewing labor disputes involving workers and clerical employees.

[Golovachev] Many letters come to the editorial office of our newspaper in which the authors express their dissatisfaction with the legislation which deprives millions of workers of the right to judicial protection. As we have learned, the USSR Council of Ministers and the AUCCTU have submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet draft documents on the repeal of the obsolete pieces of legislation mentioned above and on giving all workers regardless of the position they hold the right to go to court in the event they disagree with the decision of management to fire them. Could you, Stepan Alekseyevich, elucidate the situation and comment on the documents if they have been submitted?

[Shalayev] First of all, I would like to confirm the information which has reached you at the editorial office. Indeed, the government of the country and the AUCCTU have submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet the draft laws "On Amendments and Additions to the Legislative Acts of the USSR on Labor" and "On Cases of Dissolving the Labor Contract on the Initiative of Management Without the Consent of the Trade Union Committee of an Enterprise, Office, or Organization." They are aimed at eliminating serious flaws in our legislation which we have long come out against. At present, about 23 million workers and clerical employees do not have a right to judicial protection in the course of reviewing labor disputes associated with dismissals, transfers to other work, or disciplinary penalties (which should be one of the main rights in a democratic state).

These legal distortions date back to the distant 1930's. Initially, there was a short list of positions of leading functionaries whose dismissal could not be contested in court. However, later this list began to grow and extend to still new categories of employees. Managers of structural subdivisions, shops, foremen, and subsequently workers of some industries were allowed to appeal the decision of management on firing them only to the superior organs in the order of subordination; that is, to the subdivisions of the same organization.

Ministries and departments strengthened their power by depriving those who were forced to implement directives, instructions, and orders passed down from "on high" of their legitimate right to a defense.

This is how lists No 1 and No 2 known to all of us finally emerged specifying the categories of employees which may not only be fired without the consent of the trade union committee, but whose lawsuits no court is entitled to consider. For example, a foreman at a plant has a quarrel with a shop chief, and then the foreman is illegally fired—where is he to turn for justice? The position of a foreman is on list No 1. This means that he can only appeal to the superior organ in the order of subordination—let us say, a ministry. Over there, they might say: The director fired him, so this had to be done; the director knows best. The apparatus of the ministry frequently took the side of the director rather than his subordinate.

[Golovachev] Along which lines were these lists compiled, and who specifically is affected by them?

[Shalayev] If we take list No 1, I believe the principle is as follows: So that people who actually are the ones to perform management could be replaced with ease at any level proceeding from the top of the hierarchical ladder on down. These are managers of enterprises, offices, and organizations, their deputies and assistants, and at the plants, along with directors and their deputies, chief engineers and their deputies, chief accountants, chief designers, mechanical engineers, and other chief specialists. These are shop chiefs and their deputies, heads of departments, services, sections. There is even this wording in the list: "Managers of other structural subdivisions of enterprises who have employees subordinated to them." If you have subordinates you are on this list.

These lists apply to more than 100 categories of employees. They include directors of service establishments, stores, canteens, inspectors of the state technical inspection, inspectors of fishing management, translators of Intourist, even chief foresters, chiefs of departments in the editorial offices of radio and TV broadcasting, and many others.

In a number of sectors of the national economy, disciplinary statutes are in effect which also provide for the extensive use of procedures for reviewing labor disputes which cannot be appealed to courts. This applies to railroad, maritime, and river transportation, communications, the power, petroleum, and gas industries, and until recently to the coal industry as well. It is set forth in these statutes that complaints by an employee concerning the illegal or incorrect imposition of a disciplinary penalty are considered by the superior echelon of management. The dismissal of a worker in the event of a gross violation of discipline (pursuant to the statute) was also effected without the consent of a trade union committee.

List No 2 applies to the employees of research and scientific institutes, design, design and development, and technical organizations.... If such an employee fails to be certified and is fired he has no right to appeal to the court. This rule applies also to college instructors whose positions are filled competitively, actors, and many other creative arts employees who have failed certification.

In essence, these lists left the individual at the mercy of the management. This unfit practice resulted in many dramatic conflicts, shattered lives, and wasted talents....

[Golovachev] These "black lists" are one of the sore problems in our mailbag. Those fired "pursuant to the list" have approached not only the newspaper, but first of all the trade union organs. Has their assistance been effective?

[Shalayev] In general, hundreds of thousands of people a year turn to trade union committees and councils with their misfortunes and various questions. Actually, this is primarily what the trade unions were created for. We attempt to help the people using all of our potential, rights, and influence. Every year, tens of thousands of people whom the administration intends to fire go on working in their positions because the trade unions fail to give their consent to this. We also fight vigorously for reinstating in their positions those who were fired from their jobs in violation of the labor legislation. Despite the resistance offered by the management, we succeed in returning 3,000 to 4,000 people to their jobs annually.

However, when we encounter the dismissals of employees whose positions are enumerated in the list, helping them is very difficult. After all, the law is on the side of the administration, which is customarily used as as the ultimate shield.

[Golovachev] Have you personally had to fight for the reinstatement in his job of someone whose position is mentioned in the list?

[Shalayev] I have had to on many occasions. As a rule, they approach me when the efforts of the AUCCTU staff are not crowned with success and one has to call ministers and heads of departments. I have to explain, argue, and convince them. The following have been reinstated in their old jobs: Senior Research Associate of the TsAGI [Central Institute of Aerodynamics and Hydrodynamics] G.K. Zhustrin; Senior Research Associate of the Institute of Sociology of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Professor V.I. Bolgov; a candidate of Geological and Mineralogical Sciences and employee of one of the institutes of the USSR Academy of Sciences, M.M. Povilaytis, and a number of other comrades.

I cannot but be surprised and indignant when I read some of the documents associated with dismissals. A talented person who can be very useful to the country has to wander in order to see justice done and knock on doors. In the courts, they do not even want to discuss it: Professors and college instructors are "covered" by list No 2. Incidentally, there are many such cases. Let me mention just one case. A senior research associate of Moscow State University, Yu.M. Yemelyanov, was fired from his job as unfit for the position held. Meanwhile, the verification showed that this individual is the author of a very useful invention aimed at ecological improvements in the environment. In the opinion of the management of Moscow State University, Yu.M. Yemelyanov has published few research papers recently; instead, he was mainly involved in implementing this invention. The AUCCTU Secretariat demanded that the administration of Moscow State University reinstate the research associate in his previous position.... The situation will change immediately when the lists are abolished. The court will appoint independent experts, render a ruling, and it will be binding.

[Golovachev] Why wasn't the issue of repealing the "black lists" resolved sooner given this obvious injustice?

[Shalayev] The AUCCTU has long been trying to ensure the abolition of the two lists because of the infringement on the legitimate rights and interests of the workers. As long as 10 years ago, we submitted a proposal to abolish these lists together with the USSR general prosecutor. Technically, there were no objections but there was no real movement. The practice existed in keeping with which the USSR Council of Ministers resolved to refer the draft to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet only if the ministries and departments did not have serious reservations about it. The ministries and departments always came up with reservations, and very serious ones at that, in their opinion.

I remember that representatives of the AUCCTU had to engage in quite heavy fighting with the former leadership of the Ministry of Civil Aviation and some other ministers. Their main argument was that this measure would undermine discipline, weaken production management, and so on. However, actually it is the other way around: The reinforcement of the rule of law always promotes the reinforcement of discipline. However, at the time we did not succeed in securing the abolition of the lists.

Naturally, we did not remove the item from the agenda. Recently we have been given the firm support of the government and its chairman, N.I. Ryzhkov, despite the continuing resistance by a number of ministries. The draft legislative acts were recently submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet on behalf of the government and the AUCCTU following appropriate additional work on them.

[Golovachev] Do the drafts propose to abolish both lists completely and without qualifications?

[Shalayev] In principle these lists are to be abolished completely, although there is a small exception which, to our mind, is quite legitimate. This is how it is worded in the text of the draft law: "Labor disputes involving leading functionaries appointed or confirmed in their positions by the supreme organs of state power and government are reviewed in keeping with procedures set forth by these organs." Which leading functionaries are referred to here? Those whose appointments are confirmed by, say, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Council of Ministers. In a word, this is a very limited number of officials in the highest echelon of government. I believe it is quite logical for the supreme organs of state power and government themselves to set forth procedures for reviewing labor disputes in such cases.

Apart from this, it is proposed to eliminate the two lists completely. Therefore, in the event the laws are adopted virtually all workers of our country will be given the right to judicial protection.

[Golovachev] Among others, list No 1 includes employees of central, republic, kray, oblast, and city public organizations whose appointments are confirmed by a collective organ. After the elimination of the lists, many employees of, say, trade union councils, the AUCCTU (incidentally, as well as those of the party organs) will be able to seek protection from the court in the event of a labor dispute (not only being fired, but also being transferred to another job or reprimanded). What is your attitude toward, say, a sector chief in the AUCCTU who is transferred to the position of consultant or instructor taking the AUCCTU leadership to court?

[Shalayev] It is absolutely normal. Incidentally, I referred to this at the meeting of the USSR Council of Ministers. If an employee believes he was treated illegally and unfairly let him appeal to the commission for labor disputes, to the trade union committee, and finally to the court. Independent judges should familiarize themselves closely with all the circumstances of the case and issue a ruling. This will make it possible to do justice and rule out the manifestations of arbitrariness and personal sympathies and dislikes with regard to subordinates.

[Golovachev] Taking your case to court is the final step in a conflict. However, it can be avoided by not going as far as a court review. This is what commissions for labor disputes exist for in enterprises and organizations. However, there are many complaints in the editorial mailbag stating that very frequently these commissions have no desire to examine the conflict objectively. Worker D. Kostromin from Gorkiy writes: "It makes no sense to approach the commission for labor disputes because it consists of the representatives of management and the trade union committee."

[Shalayev] This rebuke is justified to a considerable degree, although I cannot entirely agree with Comrade Kostromin. The commissions for labor disputes operating at enterprises and in organizations review more than 500,000 employee petitions a year and act on approximately 98 percent of them in favor of the employees.

However, I believe that more labor disputes develop at enterprises than there are petitions submitted to these commissions. The point is that, to our mind, the very arrangements for forming the commissions are not completely in the interest of workers. These procedures should also be changed. Pursuant to the legislation in effect, equal numbers of representatives of management and the trade union committee are appointed members of the commission. They decide on a parity basis. Therefore, objections by a representative of the administration in the commission make it impossible to grant the request by the employee and force the latter to approach the trade union committee for action on his complaint.

A quite different resolution of this issue is outlined in the draft documents which have now been transmitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet. It is proposed that members of commissions for labor disputes be elected directly by the collectives of enterprises, organizations, and offices rather than appointed.

I believe that such independent commissions will be completely up to their tasks and will be able to review the conflicts profoundly and objectively, make a fair decision, and be fully accountable for all of this to their collective.

Assessing the documents submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet, I would like to say in summation that the draft laws fully comply with the process of democratization in our society and reinforce the judicial protection of workers. Both draft laws, "On Amendments and Additions to the Legislative Acts of the USSR on Labor" and "On Cases of Dissolving the Labor Contract on the Initiative of Management Without the Consent of the Trade Union Committee of an Enterprise, Office, or Organization," will likely be submitted for consideration by the forthcoming session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Shalayev Endorses Price Control Resolution

904A0087A Moscow TRUD in Russian 26 Nov 89 pp 1-2

[Commentary by USSR People's Deputy AUCCTU Chairman S.A. Shalayev on the price control resolution by the USSR Supreme Soviet: "Stop the Assault on the Standard of Living"]

[Text] First of all, I would like to express my profound satisfaction with the fact that the Supreme Soviet has adopted the resolution published today which affects the vital interests of the populace. The trade unions strove persistently to ensure such a solution.

I will recall that at our 6th Plenum which was held in the beginning of September of this year "The AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] Declaration on the Growth of Prices, Shortages of Goods, and the Standard of Living of the Soviet Populace" was adopted following an extensive and involved discussion on the situation in the consumer market. This document outlined the trade union position on the most "neuralgic points" disturbing our society, and extreme concern was expressed about the increasing shortage of consumer goods, runaway growth of prices, discontinuation of production of cheaper assortments, and frequent deterioration of the quality of such goods.

All by itself, the deterioration of the financial situation of the toilers called for urgent measures to be taken. However, this issue became particularly acute after the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution on the progressive taxation of the wage fund as proposed by the government. That is to say, the growth of the monetary income of the toilers is restricted from as soon as this October, when the taxation resolution took effect, and until the end of next year. It could be that such temporary extraordinary measures are needed in the current emergency situation. However, we are fully aware that, first, this measure does not facilitate but rather stifles the development of the economic reform, initiative, and industriousness of the collectives with regard to the development of production. Secondly, given the uncontrolled price increase this could strike a powerful blow at the standard of living of millions of people. In response to the strict curbs on incomes, the trade unions were obligated to raise the issue of equally strict measures to "freeze" prices for a corresponding period of time.

Sometimes, we get to hear that this measure is, supposedly, of an administrative nature and does not "mesh" with the logic of the economic reform. Indeed, this is obviously an administrative measure, as well as the decision on progressive taxation. However, we apparently cannot do without such temporary administrative devices during the period of transition. Of course, there is no doubt that we should search for and put to use the economic ways of stabilizing monetary circulation, curing finances, and influencing prices and the consumer market faster and more vigorously.

Proceeding from the above, it is understandable why the AUCCTU plenum demanded that the USSR Government and the Councils of Ministers of union republics immediately take measures aimed at "freezing" the prices for basic foodstuffs and manufactured goods on which the consumer budget hinges, introducing ceilings for retail prices for potatoes, fruit and vegetable products, making the state control over the prices for goods and services stricter, and saturating the consumer market with necessities.

With the participation of the AUCCTU, the USSR Council of Ministers prepared proposals concerning additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and reinforce the state control over prices for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet.

As we may see, the resolution adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet takes into account all the main proposals of the trade unions. It is very significant that a list of consumer staples the level of state retail prices for which is "frozen," that is, will be maintained without changes, has been set forth by the government and codified by the Supreme Soviet. This list is given in point 4 of the resolution, and contains more than 20 items, from bread, meat, fish, butter, milk, and other foodstuffs to clothing and footwear for children and old people at prices reduced for social considerations.

Restrictions on contract prices are another major measure. They are the ones responsible to a considerable degree for the rapid growth of inflation. This is most vividly seen in the textile and light industry. For example, Perm Garments Factory No 7 of the Perm Industrial and Trade Association sells at increased prices 100 percent of silk dresses for women, 82 percent of woolen and 72 percent of knit goods.

At the meeting of the Supreme Soviet, the following example was given: A stool sold in one area of our country for six rubles began to cost 26 after the introduction of contract prices.... On the whole, more than one-fifth of the increment in the overall volume of sales in the state and [consumer] cooperative trade between January and September of this year (R6 billion) was generated by increasing average retail prices within the group. The less affluent strata of the population suffered in the course of this price race.

This is why it is so important that from 1 January 1990 on contract prices for new non-food items cannot, as a rule, be confirmed with a surcharge of more than 30 percent of the state retail price. I will note that in January of this year the government placed a 15-percent cap on the level of surcharges on prices for the goods with the N [new product] index as requested by the trade unions. The cap on surcharges has now been extended to all other goods with the D [sold at contract prices] index for which it is still possible to use such prices.

Fruit and vegetable products and potatoes which were not covered by the price "freeze" are a separate topic. As early as the March (1989) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, in the course of working out its resolutions, the AUCCTU stated its disagreement with the uncontrolled setting of contract prices by suppliers and consumers for potatoes, fruit, and vegetables, and the products of their processing, including canned foods, but, unfortunately, our position was not taken into account. The application of the government resolution on contract prices, including those for such products delivered to all-union and republic stocks, did not solve the problem of the shortage of potatoes and vegetables. However, in many regions it has caused more dissatisfaction by the toilers, especially the less affluent populace.

In conjunction with this, an appeal was made on behalf of the AUCCTU plenum to the USSR Government, the Councils of Ministers of union and autonomous republics, and executive committees of the oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies to consider the issue indicated yet again. By now, it has been resolved in a particular manner in the resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet: It has been recommended that the Supreme Soviets of union republics review the issue of setting ceilings for retail prices differentiated by the season for the most important types of fruit and vegetable products and potatoes. We will stress that this measure does not affect the contract prices established between kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] and trade. At issue is capping the retail price at which trade establishments sell these products to the populace. In this event, the difference between retail and contract procurement prices should be covered by the local budget.

All of these measures will make it possible to protect the buyer from arbitrary prices which may be set on various pretexts.

Undoubtedly, specific government measures aimed at increasing the production of goods and preventing the "disappearance" of cheap products which are sought after by the populace will meet with the broad approval by the populace. The USSR Supreme Soviet has laid down in the law that the Councils of Ministers of union republics will envisage state orders for producing goods for children and older citizens, including goods at prices reduced for social considerations, in draft plans of economic and social development.

I would also like to stress the particular significance of measures carried out under the auspices of the government and aimed at saturating the market with consumer staples which are in short supply at present and which are causing considerable social tension and concern among the Soviet people. They include detergents, toothpaste, notebooks for schoolchildren, and other goods named in the resolution of the Supreme Soviet. The government also undertook to take all the necessary measures for improving the supply of medicines to the population.

In the environment of the shortage of goods, measures are needed to strictly monitor the exports of goods in demand over and above the state plans for economic cooperation with foreign countries. Many cases involving the exports of foodstuffs and consumer staples in short supply in our country which thus exacerbate further their availability in the domestic market have caused the indignation of Soviet people. For example, the Littorgodezhda Association (let us stress that it is not a foodstuffs company) has exported 280 tons of unsalted butter this year, the Rostovrybprom—1.5 tons of soft caviar, the Ussuri Oil and Fat Combine—195 tons of laundry soap. The Roskhoztorg and other organizations have also exported detergents in short supply this year.

Meanwhile, we have been buying these goods abroad for hard currency. Through the channels of local trade, hundreds of thousands of meters of cotton, shirt, and lining fabrics, tens of thousands of sets of bed linens, footwear, knitted goods, and other goods in short supply have been siphoned abroad. All of this was on top of the state plans for cooperation with foreign countries.

The AUCCTU Plenum demanded that order be restored in this sphere, and under the current circumstances the exports of foodstuffs and manufactured goods which our people lack be discontinued. We cannot but welcome the support given by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the government to this proposal of ours. The resolution of the Supreme Soviet acknowledges the feasibility of introducing the licensing of exports of consumer goods and main types of raw materials for their production. That is, at issue is the fact that all participants in foreign economic contacts will have to solicit the permission of the USSR Government for signing agreements and contracts with foreign partners involving these goods.

Judging by the initial response, this resolution of the USSR Supreme Soviet which has already been covered in the press and on TV has been received with great satisfaction by the populace. All the more so, it is deplorable that some members of the Supreme Soviet strove to prevent the consideration of this issue in the Supreme Soviet and the adoption of a corresponding resolution. We cannot agree with the assertion by Deputy N. Sazonov who stated that "at the 2nd Session, we have spent 75 percent of the time resolving some specific and short-term issues...." Referring to the position of trade unions with regard to speculator cooperatives which have caused extensive social dissatisfaction the deputy said: "For a month, we discussed the emotional decision of the AUCCTU on cooperatives. Was it really an important issue...? Once again, they are trying to lead us astray into discussing short-term, specific issues...." It is hard to imagine the most acute issues associated with everyday concerns of the people and improvments in their life being called "short- term" and "specific" given the current situation. I am convinced that tens of millions of people suffering due to the mounting inflation and the most acute shortage of goods think otherwise. The results of voting in the course of which an absolute majority of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted the resolution published in TRUD today were a very convincing response to the attempts by some deputies to discontinue the discussion of the document proposed.

Therefore, the resolution has been adopted. Much organizational work on the part of economic, management, and price-setting organs and our trade union organs in the field is necessary in order to fully implement the resolution. Certainly, this also applies to the government and the AUCCTU. We are aware of many cases when sound and much-needed resolutions were adopted but they got stuck somewhere in the intermediate management echelons and ultimately caused nothing but profound disappointment. We cannot allow this to happen in this case because social tensions in our society have reached a high level. We are aware of our very great tasks associated with implementing this resolution.

New Commission To Help With Defense Conversion

LD1412184889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1041 GMT 14 Dec 89

[Excerpts] Chelyabinsk, 14 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Tkachenko reports:

The Kirov Mechanical Works in Yuryuzan (Southern Urals) has produced its last batch of ammunition. In two weeks' time, it will be one of the Soviet Union's first three defense enterprises to switch over completely to the production of peaceful goods. Works director Anatoliy Sapozhnikov shared his thoughts on this with me. [passage omitted]

The conversion of military production, which is growing in scale, affects the interests of millions of Soviet people. Issues connected with it are also being discussed at the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies, which is now taking place. Many deputies think it is time that the Soviet Parliament passed a law on conversion. The recently founded Soviet national commission for the promotion of the conversion of military production [sovetskaya natsionalnaya komissiya sodeystviya konversii voyennogo proizvodstva] comprising eminent scientists, specialists and public figures, will also help to solve the problems that arise.

Rumors of 'Substantial' Car Price Hikes Denied

PM1512143589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Dec 89 Morning Edition p 11

[V. Tolstov report under the "Rumors and Facts" rubric: "No Hike in Car Prices"]

[Text] Once again Moscow car fans and especially those who are just about to buy a car have been troubled by alarming rumors that next year there is going to be a substantial hike in car prices.

I must say straight away that this is just another empty rumor. As IZVESTIYA was told at the USSR State Committee for Prices, no work related to increasing car prices is being done.

Nevertheless, by word of mouth "reliable" information is circulating that prices for the most luxurious makes of car—Volga, the new Moskvich, and the sixth and seventh Zhiguli models—are rising by unprecedented amounts: Not even to R20,000 but perhaps to R25,000. The rest will rise by 40 percent. It is claimed that some people have even seen cards from the car dealership informing customers waiting for cars of the new prices.

On the instructions of the USSR Council of Ministers, specialists from the USSR State Committee for Prices and the USSR Ministry of Trade checked the showrooms in Moscow a few days ago and found no trace of cards displaying increased prices. Thus it can be concluded that if such cards were really sent to purchasers they were forgeries designed to spread false information to alarm people.

I do not believe that there are any grounds for panic or haste in paying an inflated amount for a fairly dilapidated vehicle or for besieging car showrooms to demand that they get through the waiting list faster. The experience of last year shows that this is fuss over nothing. The USSR State Committee for Prices states that it isn't even planning to raise prices.

Scientific

USSR launches 'Raduga' Communications Satellite

LD1612084889 Moscow TASS in English 0840 GMT 16 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 16 TASS—A communication satellite was launched by a Proton booster rocket in the Soviet Union on Friday.

The satellite, Raduga, carries relaying equipment intended for ensuring telephone, telegraph and radio communication and transmitting television programmes.

The satellite was put into orbit, close to a stationary one, with the the following parameters:

Distance from the earth's surface—36,551 kilometers,
Period of revolution—24 hours 35 degrees,
Inclination of the orbit—1.5 degrees.

The on-board equipment is operating normally. The satellite is controlled by a coordination-and-computer centre.

The communication and television equipment will be operated in accordance with a preset programme.

Military

Yazov Interviewed at Moscow Officers' Meeting

LD1612204589 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2040 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Interview with Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister, by unidentified correspondent, at an officers' meeting in Moscow; date not given; from the "View" program —recorded]

[Text] [Video shows Yazov at officers' meeting, being interviewed] [Correspondent] The "View" program. May I ask you a few questions?

[Yazov] Certainly.

[Correspondent] Tell me, is what has happened here a democratization of the Army?

[Yazov] Undoubtedly.

[Correspondent] Yet KRASNAYA ZVEZDA writes that the officers' meetings will be a consultative body of the Command, and thereby help to strengthen the combined military and political command. Is there not a contradiction here?

[Yazov] No, there is no contradiction. Every combined commander, if he has an interest in seeing that the officers live well under his command, and work well, must take account of their interests, take into account their advice, listen to them. Surely it will be no bad thing if the commander of a regiment, at an officers' meeting, studies the officers, if he determines their service activity in accordance with the results of their work? After all, he knows the results of the work of a specific officer. I consider that the officers' meeting is a help both to democratization and to glasnost. The officers' meeting can also take account of the interests of other social institutions, such as the Attestation Commission, the Women's Council, People's Control [pauses]...the officers' meeting can also take that into account.

[Correspondent] Tell me, Dmitriy Timofeyevich, organs parallel to the official structures are now being created, such as the informal servicemen's trade union, known as Shield, and so on. What is your attitude to organizations of this kind?

[Yazov] I do not know such an organization, and the Army doesn't need any sort of help or shield. We are capable of defending ourselves, and we don't need any retired officers to defend us.

[Correspondent] I see. Who are your favorite writers?

[Yazov] Pushkin. Dostoievskiy. Lermontov.

[Correspondent] And among Soviet writers?

[Yazov] I'd say, Nikolay Ostrovskiy, Mayakovskiy, Gorkiy. Well, I also like Karpov, I read everything he writes. I like [pauses]...and many others.

[Correspondent] What newspapers do your working day begin with?

[Yazov] My working day begins with PRAVDA. And KRASNAYA ZVEZDA.

[Correspondent] What papers does it end with?

[Yazov] Well, it's not every day that I get a chance to read the newspapers. I have so many documents, and I need at least 12 or 14 hours to get through those.

[Correspondent] When will you pay us a visit on "View"? You've been promising for a long time.

[Yazov] I think "View" can come to me!

[Correspondent] Isn't it more interesting, though, to go on the air live?

[Yazov] It's interesting, certainly. If "View" can't come to the defense Ministry and look around, talk, consult [pauses)..."View" very often gives nonobjective materials about the Army. Do you really think it's fair? You should come here, talk with the officers, ask them what sort of Army we should have. Ask him!

[Correspondent] I've already asked them. I've talked with the officers, and now I'm talking to you.

[Yazov] Otherwise, some old lady in a shop is asked what kind of army she wants? Well, what does she know about what kind of Army we should have?

[Correspondent] But her opinion must also be taken into account sometimes.

[Yazov] You need to consider the opinion of a competent person.

Defense Ministry Reports 1990 Military Spending

LD1512174689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1127 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] The overall sum of defense expenditure in the Soviet Union in 1990 will amount to R70.9758 billion which is R6.3184 (8.2 percent) lower than this year. This is stated in a report for the press which has been circulated here by the USSR Ministry of Defense in connection with the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of a law "On the USSR State Budget for 1990."

For the purchase of armaments and military equipment next year, R31,036.5 million is being allocated; for scientific-research and testing and design work—R13,154 million; for maintaining the Army and navy—R19,323.3 million; for military construction—R3,715.8 million; pensions for military servicemen—R2,440 million; and for other expenses—R1,306.2 million.

At the present time, in connection with the unilateral reduction which is being carried out and the fulfillment of the treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles, substantial changes have occurred in the armed forces toward a reduction in their numbers, as well as the quantity of basic types of armaments. The overall number of armed forces personnel of the USSR will by 1 January 1990 amount to 3,993,000 men.

As far as the numbers of USSR strategic nuclear weapons are concerned, according to the Ministry of Defense data the Soviet side has 2,484 intercontinental ballistic missiles launchers (ICBM), submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM), and heavy bombers. The USSR strategic potential comprises 1398 ICBM launchers, including 760 ICBM launchers equipped with individually-targeted multiple re-entry vehicles (MRV); 924 SLBM launchers, including 440 individually targeted MRV; and 162 heavy bombers, of which 97 are equipped with cruise missiles. The Soviet Union has in total approximately 10,000 nuclear warheads on strategic delivery systems.

Among other types of armaments, the USSR has 8,207 airforce frontal aviation aircraft, air defense aviation [AVIATSII PROTIVOVOZDUSHNOY OBORONY], and naval aviation aircraft, as well as 4,014 combat helicopters, including naval combat helicopters. At present the armed forces have 1,723 tactical-missile launchers, 63,900 tanks, including amphibious tanks, 76,520 infantry fighting vehicles and armored personnel carriers, 66,800 multiple rocket launchers, guns, and mortars (100 mm caliber and above).

The USSR Navy has at its disposal 260 submarines (apart from submarines with strategic ballistic missiles), of which 113 are atomic. It also has 157 large surface ships, including 4 aircraft carriers.

Chervov Says 265,000 Discharged From Armed Forces

LD1512174789 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 15 Dec 89

[Text] Moscow December 15 TASS—The Soviet Union has now fulfilled by more than half the decision on a unilateral cut in the Soviet Armed Forces by 500,000 men, Soviet Defence Ministry Spokesman Colonel General Nikolay Chervov told a news conference here today in view of the adoption by the USSR Supreme Soviet of the law "On a State Budget for 1990" and the publication of data on the Soviet Union's next year's defence expenditures in the press.

The cut had been announced by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev at the United Nations.

By now 265,000 men have already been discharged from the Soviet Armed Forces. In addition to the unilateral reduction, the armed forces discharged 173,000 students.

The Soviet Armed Forces, Chervov said, are being given a non- offensive structure. Their strike weapon systems are being limited. The operations training of the army and the navy are changing.

The number of large-scale exercises has been considerably reduced. Military technical programmes are being revised and plans for the quantity production of weapons and hardware are being cut, he said.

"Carrying out a set of practical measures to implement our defensive doctrine," the general emphasised, "we are guided by the principled line towards predictability and openness in the military field. Herein we see one of the ways for confidence-building and, in the end, reduction in military danger."

The budget for 1990 will enable the Soviet Union to maintain defences at the level of reasonable sufficiency and tackle all matters concerning the further raising of the living standards of Soviet servicemen, of the Soviet Army and Navy, Colonel General Vladimir Babyev added.

The two generals also emphasised that the announced budget "does not include funds for defence industry conversion" and that it mentions only funds for the maintenance of the army and the navy and their provision with appropriate types of armaments and hardware.

Officers' Assembly Appeals for Improved 'Quality'

PM1412162589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Dec 89 Single Edition p 2

["Appeal By Participants of the All-Army Officers' Assembly To USSR Armed Forces Officers"]

[Text] Dear comrades!

The All-Army Officers Assembly is being held at a difficult and crucial time for the fate of the motherland and socialism. Revolutionary transformations are being implemented in the country.

The new political thinking and the warming of the international climate have changed the approach to questions of military building and army and navy training. The efficiency of this work is now determined primarily by qualitative parameters. The defensive nature of Soviet military doctrine is being embodied in practical deeds. The country's military budget and the size of the USSR Armed Forces are being cut.

But the threat has still not been eliminated. The trend toward disarmament has still not become universal and irreversible. This is the reality and it cannot be ignored. In these conditions the officer corps' responsibility for the defense of the socialist fatherland must in no way be reduced.

Tasks in training and educating servicemen are becoming more complicated in the present situation. Pacifist sentiments are increasing among young people. The sacred concepts of military duty, honor, dignity, loyalty to the oath, combat fraternity and soldierly comradeship are being devalued. Certain forces are trying to falsify military history and discredit military service. Voices can be heard demanding that military-patriotic education be abandoned. But how can one educate a patriot and citizen without cultivating in him from the beginning a sense of personal responsibility and willingness to take up arms to defend his land, relatives and friends?!

We realize that the negative phenomena in society and the Armed Forces have been caused by stagnation in sociopolitical, economic, and spiritual and moral development. We, cadre officers, like all Soviet people, are concerned about the social anomalies and the antisocialist, extremist forces which have emerged and which are influencing the situation in military collectives. Instances of favoritism, official abuses, deception, and flattery are arousing justified indignation.

We have a lot to do to strengthen the moral-political climate in the Armed Forces and to raise the prestige of the profession of soldier of the motherland and the prestige of military service. We are deeply convinced that almost the main concern with which we should begin is to make the facets of the officer's valor and honor shine once again.

Great professionalism, assiduousness, justice, firmness of convictions, sincerity, kindness, and personal charm are the qualities which we have inherited from the officers of the troops of Peter I, Alexander Suvorov and Mikhail Kutuzov, the proletarian commander Frunze, and the heroes of the Great Patriotic War—Marshals Zhukov, Rokossovskiy and other celebrated military leaders. It is we, the direct heirs to military glory, who today have to continue and augment the traditions of the red commanders and commissars. So let us devote all our efforts to ensuring that the Army and Navy are always in a state of high combat readiness. Let us do everything to ensure that they continue to enhance their political and military vigilance, worthily carry out their duty to the people, and be a reliable bastion of peace and security.

All the multifaceted activity of the USSR Armed Forces is now being restructured. The quality of performance of combat training tasks, the level of organization and discipline in units, ships and subunits, and the moral and political state of multinational military collectives depend largely on our initiative, competence, persistence, and assiduousness. Profoundly aware of this, we call on all officers to tirelessly improve the organization of the training and educational process and raise the effectiveness and quality of each field exercise, flight, sea voyage, and alert duty.

Life is urgently putting on the agenda the question of more vigorously implementing within the Armed Forces of the party line of increasing the role and influence of political organs and party organizations. The leadership of military building by the Communist Party has been and remains the basis for ensuring the Soviet state's defense capability.

We call on commanders, political workers, and all officers to be closer to people and more accessible to them. Each of us should have a deep understanding of his subordinates, be able to listen to them, know their needs and requirements, and help in word and in deed. Each of us must set an example in fulfilling his service and party duty and devote himself to the cause of defending the motherland. Our duty is to educate real masters of military work, patriots and internationalists devoted to the ideals of the socialist motherland, which is preparing to celebrate the 45th anniversary of the Great Victory, and of the Leninist party as it approaches its 28th congress.

In heroic-patriotic work with young people and in preparing them for military service we are counting on assistance from war, army, and navy veterans and internationalist soldiers, whose experience of combat and life should be actively passed on to the young generation. We call on the officers constituting the Soviet Armed Forces' corps of deputies to help in every way to strengthen the country's defense and prestige and to defend army and navy interests.

On behalf of all Soviet officers we, the participants in the All-Army Officers' Assembly, assure the Soviet people and the Communist Party Central Committee that our Army and Navy will always be true to their constitutional duty.